

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY
Weekly Report

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

VOL. XVI
PAGES 1343-1366

WEEK ENDING OCT. 24, 1958

No. 43

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Congressional Quiz	ii
Presidential Report	1359
Pressures On Congress	1362
Political Notes	1363
Around The Capitol	1365
Committee Roundup	1366
What's Ahead	iii
Week In Congress	iv

Party Unity Voting

**Parties Split on 42 Percent
Of Roll Calls in 1958**

Page 1343

**Voting Estimates
For 1958**
Page 1364

**Major Campaign
Developments**
Page 1363

Western Political Outlook

Page 1350

**NAACP Rates Congress;
UMW Endorses Candidates**

Page 1362

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Page 1348

COPYRIGHT 1958

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON 6, D. C. • STerling 3-8060

AMERICAN CONGRESSES

The United States Congress is one of the oldest continuing legislative bodies in the world. What do you know about its history? Try for four correct answers.

1. Q--Even before the formation of the United States in 1789, the colonies that were to form the Union had a Congress that met at various times from 1774-1789 and helped carry on the Revolution. It was called (a) the North American Congress; (b) the Continental Congress; (c) the Colonial Congress; (d) the Patriots Congress?

A--(b). The first president of the Continental Congress was Peyton Randolph of Virginia.

2. Q--Here's a trick question: a moment of thought should enable you to get it. How many Senate seats were there in the first United States Congress (1789-91)?

A--Twenty-six -- two Senators for each of the 13 original states of the Union.

3. Q--After the Civil War, a group of Northeastern Republicans dominated the U.S. Congress (many Southerners who had adhered to the Confederacy were barred from office.) They were led in the House by Thaddeus Stevens. They were called (a) the War Hawks; (b) the Reconstructionists; (c) the Radical Republicans?

A--(c). Stevens, a Pennsylvanian, was chairman of the managers appointed by the House to conduct the impeachment proceedings against President Andrew Johnson (1868). The Radical Republicans continued to dominate the Congress even after Stevens died in 1868.

4. Q--When Alaska's two Senators take their seats in 1959, the membership of the Senate will rise from 96 to 98. There have been 96 Senate seats for approximately (a) 100 years; (b) 75 years; (c) 50 years?

A--(c). In 1912 New Mexico and Arizona, the 47th and 48th states, entered the Union, bringing the Senate membership to 96.

5. Q--At one time during the history of the United States, a rival Congress, purporting to represent a large area of the country, was elected. It lasted about four years. Can you give the name of the Congress, its approximate dates and the President of the nation it ruled?

A--The Congress of the Confederate States of America, formed at the beginning of the Civil War in 1861, lasted till the defeat of the South in 1865. The President of the Confederacy was Jefferson Davis.

6. Q--Since 1930, the Republican party has controlled both chambers of Congress simultaneously only twice. Name the years.

A--1947 to 1949, during President Truman's first Administration; and 1953 to 1955, during President Eisenhower's first Administration.

7. Q--With the growth of the U.S. population, the number of seats in the House of Representatives has increased steadily since the first U.S. Congress, which started with 65 seats. Today the House has approximately (a) 320 seats; (b) 430 seats; (c) 620 seats?

A--(b). The 85th Congress (1957-59) had 435 House seats, as has every Congress since 1911.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

A service for editors and standard reference on U.S. Congress

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth.

Senior Writers: David S. Broder, Mary W. Cohn, William A. Korns, Helene C. Monberg, Spegcer A. Rich, George C. Wilson.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatrnuck, Ruth Hussey, Robert W. Kaufman, Eleanor King, Paul Means, Gladys Miller, Shirley Seib, Edward T. Walsh.

C. Q. Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rathbun.

Editorial Assistants: Roberta Russell, Wayne Walker.

Publisher: Buel F. Wear.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin Jr.

Copyright 1958 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class mail privileges authorized at Washington, District of Columbia.

PARTIES IN OPPOSITION ON 42 PERCENT OF ROLL CALLS

Major findings of Congressional Quarterly's 1958 survey of Party Unity are as follows:

- **Partisanship**, as measured by the number of roll calls on which Democratic and Republican majorities disagreed, declined somewhat in 1958. The two majorities split on 42 percent of the 1958 roll calls, compared with 47 percent in 1957 and 50 percent in 1956.
- **Democrats**, in control of both House and Senate, won 71 of the 124 partisan showdowns in 1958 -- 51 of 87 in the Senate and 20 of 37 in the House.
- The average Democratic Senator voted with his party majority appreciably more often (71 percent of the time) than did the average Republican Senator (64 percent). In the House, the average Democrat scored 66 percent; the average Republican 65 percent.
- The most consistent supporters of their party positions were Westerners and Midwesterners in both parties, while the most consistent opponents of the party positions were Southerners in both parties.

The Party Line

The concept of party discipline and the party line associated with the workings of the British Parliament is absent from the United States Congress. Although the Democratic or Republican line on a particular issue may be established in a party caucus, it is rarely a matter of official public knowledge. Party leaders in Senate and House may lay down a line in floor debate, but it does not follow that a majority of their colleagues will follow them. In 1958, for example, a majority of Republican and Democratic Senators defied their leaders to vote for repeal of Federal excise taxes on transportation.

It is for this reason that CQ uses the automatic device of selecting, as Party Unity roll calls, all votes in which the result shows a majority of one party in opposition to a majority of the other party. In each instance, however, the majority may range from one more than one-half of the party members present and voting to party unanimity.

The fact that the average Member of Congress votes with the majority of his party, when it is opposed to the majority of the other party, only about two-thirds of the time underscores the absence of strong party discipline. In 1958, as in prior years, most of each party's legislative defeats came on votes where its members were badly split. Only 17 of the 53 Democratic losses and 19 of the 71 Republican losses were attributable to the defection of less than one-quarter of the party's members present and voting.

The roll calls lost in this fashion, together with their CQ numbers and Weekly Report pages, are as follows:

Lost by Democratic defectors: In the Senate -- RC 8 and 10, postal rates, p. 265; RC 20 and 22, emergency housing bill, p. 335, RC 30, farm surplus disposal, p. 371; RC 40, 41 and 43, community facilities, p. 443 and 493;

Definitions

• **PARTY UNITY ROLL CALLS** -- Roll-call votes that split the parties, a majority of voting Democrats opposing a majority of voting Republicans. Roll calls on which either party divides evenly are excluded.

• **PARTY UNITY SCORES** -- Percentage of Party Unity roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote, even if a Member announces his stand, lower his score. (For names of Members missing one or more 1958 roll calls because of their illness or illness or death in their families, see Weekly Report p. 1268.)

• **OPPOSITION TO PARTY SCORES** -- Percentage of Party Unity roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. A Member's Party Unity and Opposition to Party scores add to 100 percent only if he voted on all Party Unity roll calls.

RC 71 and 72, temporary unemployment benefits, p. 701; RC 149, humane slaughter, p. 1021. In the House -- RC 14, Olympic winter games, p. 372; RC 59, Senate office building, p. 916; RC 65, wholesale marketing facilities, p. 1018; RC 69, community facilities, p. 1056; RC 80, omnibus housing bill, p. 1120.

Lost by Republican defectors: In the Senate -- RC 24, price supports freeze, p. 370; RC 33, farm surplus disposal, p. 371; RC 46, community facilities, p. 494; RC 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58 and 61, amendments to pension fund disclosure bill, p. 555, 556 and 557 (for analysis of these defections, see Weekly Report p. 596); RC 94 and 105, amendments to Kennedy-Ives labor bill, p. 809 and 814; RC 138, development fund study, p. 980; RC 153, independent offices appropriation, p. 1022; RC 199 and 200, Lake Michigan water diversion, p. 1150. In the House -- RC 15 and 16, price supports freeze, p. 372; RC 42, Defense Department reorganization, p. 768.

A glance at the high scorers in Party Unity and Opposition to Party (see next page), particularly in the Senate, sheds an interesting light on the question of true party philosophy. The Democratic Senators with the highest Party Unity scores are by any definition among the party's liberals, while the highest Republican scorers are no less clearly among their party's conservatives. By the same token, conservative Southern Democrats lead in Opposition to Party; their Republican counterparts, on the other hand, are among the party's liberals. This would suggest that it is the liberals who most closely reflect the views of the Democratic majority, while it is the conservatives who speak for the Republican majority.

Party Unity Scoreboard

The table below shows the proportion of Party Unity roll calls in 1955, 1956, 1957 and 1958:

	Total Roll Calls	Party Unity Roll Calls	Percent of Total
1958			
BOTH CHAMBERS	293	124	42%
Senate	200	87	44
House	93	37	40
1957			
BOTH CHAMBERS	207	97	47%
Senate	107	38	36
House	100	59	59
1956			
BOTH CHAMBERS	203	101	50%
Senate	130	69	53
House	73	32	44
1955			
BOTH CHAMBERS	163	57	35%
Senate	87	26	30
House	76	31	41

1958 Victories, Defeats

On the Party Unity roll calls of 1958 --

	Senate	House	Total
Dems Won, GOP Lost	51	20	71
GOP Won, Dems Lost	36	17	53
Dems Voted Unanimously	7	1	8
GOP Voted Unanimously	0	0	0

Party Scores

Party Unity and Opposition to Party scores below are composites of individual scores, and show the percentage of time the average Democrat and Republican voted with his party majority in disagreement with the other party's majority. Failures to vote tend to lower both Party Unity and Opposition to Party scores.

	1958		85th CONGRESS	
	DEM.	GOP	DEM.	GOP
PARTY UNITY				
Both Chambers	68%	65%	69%	66%
Senate	71	64	69	66
House	66	65	68	66
OPPOSITION TO PARTY				
Both Chambers	19%	23%	19%	22%
Senate	16	22	16	20
House	20	24	20	22

Regional Scores

Party Unity scores, by region, for 1958:

	East	West	South	Midwest
DEMOCRATS				
Both Chambers	71%	77%	60%	75%
Senate	71	77	65	76
House	71	77	58	74
REPUBLICANS				
Both Chambers	60%	68%	67%	68%
Senate	58	74	55	67
House	61	64	72	70

Opposition to Party scores, by region, for 1958:

	East	West	South	Midwest
DEMOCRATS				
Both Chambers	15%	9%	25%	15%
Senate	14	8	20	15
House	15	9	28	15
REPUBLICANS				
Both Chambers	25%	24%	27%	20%
Senate	26	17	38	19
House	25	29	22	21

Individual Scores

Highest Party Unity scorers -- those who voted with their party majority most consistently in 1958:

SENATE			
Democrats		Republicans	
Mansfield (Mont.)	95%	Hickenlooper (Iowa)	87%
Proxmire (Wis.)	94	Watkins (Utah)	86
Carroll (Colo.)	92	Curtis (Neb.)	86
Morse (Ore.)	91	Knowland (Calif.)	85
Hill (Ala.)	90	Dworshak (Idaho)	85
Symington (Mo.)	90	Williams (Del.)	85
Douglas (Ill.)	90	Mundt (S.D.)	84
Church (Idaho)	89	Martin (Iowa)	84
Sparkman (Ala.)	89		

HOUSE			
Democrats		Republicans	
Brooks (Texas)	95%	Chiperfield (Ill.)	97%
Perkins (Ky.)	95	Betts (Ohio)	97
Aspinall (Colo.)	95	Taber (N.Y.)	97
King (Calif.)	95	Stauffer (Pa.)	97
Porter (Ore.)	95	Alger (Texas)	95
Santangelo (N.Y.)	95	Schenck (Ohio)	95
		Brown (Ohio)	95
		Ray (N.Y.)	95
		Hiestand (Calif.)	95
		Becker (N.Y.)	95

Highest Opposition to Party scorers -- those who voted against their party majority most consistently in 1958:

SENATE			
Democrats		Republicans	
Lausche (Ohio)	61%	Langer (N.D.)	67%
Byrd (Va.)	55	Cooper (Ky.)	55
Thurmond (S.C.)	51	Case (N.J.)	54
Robertson (Va.)	45	Aiken (Vt.)	53
Stennis (Miss.)	30	Smith (Maine)	51
Russell (Ga.)	30	Javits (N.Y.)	49
Eastland (Miss.)	29	Malone (Nev.)	49

HOUSE			
Democrats		Republicans	
Haley (Fla.)	70%	Fulton (Pa.)	68%
Abbitt (Va.)	65	Bennett (Mich.)	65
Herlong (Fla.)	65	O'Konski (Wis.)	65
Gary (Va.)	62	Morrow (N.H.)	65
Harrison (Va.)	62	Canfield (N.J.)	62
		Holmes (Wash.)	62
		Baldwin (Calif.)	59
		Patterson (Conn.)	59

Party Unity-Opposition Scores

Senate Party Unity -- 1958 and 85th Congress

1. PARTY UNITY, 1958. Percentage of 87 Senate Party Unity roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. (Party Unity roll calls are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans.) Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
2. PARTY OPPOSITION, 1958. Percentage of 87 Senate Party Unity roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
3. PARTY UNITY, 85th Congress. Percentage of 125 Senate Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
4. PARTY OPPOSITION, 85th Congress. Percentage of 125 Senate Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.

Headnotes

- Not a Senator in 1957; also used for Sen. Proxmire, seated Aug. 29, 1957, who was not eligible for any Party Unity roll calls in 1957.

† Not eligible for all 38 Party Unity roll calls in 1957; percentage score is based on number of votes for which Senator was eligible.

* Not eligible for all 87 Party Unity roll calls in 1958; percentage score is based on number of votes for which Senator was eligible.

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
ALABAMA					IOWA					NEBRASKA					RHODE ISLAND				
Hill	90	8	89	9	Hickenlooper	87	6	87	7	Curtis	86	9	85	12	Green	78	13	77	13
Sparkman	89	9	83	9	Martin	84	9	85	9	Hruska	77	5	80	5	Pastore	75	17	70	21
ARIZONA					KANSAS					NEVADA					SOUTH CAROLINA				
Hayden	77	16	78	16	Carlson	68	15	70	14	Bible	75	16	76	14	Johnston	79	18	81	16
Goldwater	77	5	70	7	Schoepfel	77	7	74	7	Malone	37	49	34	46	Thurmond	48	51	54	44
ARKANSAS					KENTUCKY					NEW HAMPSHIRE					SOUTH DAKOTA				
Fulbright	69	13	65	11	Cooper	39	55	47	46	Bridges	82	3	65	2	Case	62	25	59	30
McClellan	62	22	67	19	Morton	71	21	75	19	Cotton	83	10	80	10	Mundt	84	16	76	22
CALIFORNIA					LOUISIANA					NEW JERSEY					TENNESSEE				
Knowland	85	7	86	5	Ellender	60	23	61	22	Case	43	54	51	46	Gore	59	7	62	8
Kuchel	62	36	68	30	Long	71	10	75	10	Smith	59	18	61	15	Kefauver	87	5	83	6
COLORADO					MAINE					NEW MEXICO					TEXAS				
Carroll	92	5	85	12	Payne	30	43	30	31	Anderson	70	18	70	17	Yarborough	68	1	73†	1†
Allott	84	14	79	13	Smith	49	51	58	42	Chavez	48	7	52	7	Johnson	83	7	76	11
CONNECTICUT					MARYLAND					NEW YORK					UTAH				
Bush	72	16	77	14	Beall	55	43	62	34	Ives	38	30	46	26	Bennett	75	5	78	5
Purtell	61	24	66	20	Butler	75	7	70	9	Javits	32	49	42†	41†	Watkins	86	8	88	6
DELAWARE					MASSACHUSETTS					NORTH CAROLINA					VERMONT				
Frear	49	23	50	22	Kennedy	74	8	70	10	Ervin	70	24	75	18	Aiken	47	53	51	46
Williams	85	13	82	16	Saltonstall	69	16	74	15	Jordan	53*	35*	-	-	Flanders	36	7	41	7
FLORIDA					MICHIGAN					NORTH DAKOTA					VIRGINIA				
Holland	47	24	51	27	McNamara	85	10	79	16	Langer	18	67	18	57	Byrd	20	55	29	46
Smathers	67	13	62	16	Potter	72	23	76	18	Young	43	38	38	39	Robertson	40	45	41	41
GEORGIA					MINNESOTA					OHIO					WASHINGTON				
Russell	63	30	66	26	Humphrey	86	7	76	14	Lausche	23	61	26	60	Jackson	80	6	80	10
Talmadge	64	24	67	20	Thye	47	43	57	35	Bricker	64	2	70	3	Magnuson	82	3	82	5
IDAHO					MISSISSIPPI					OKLAHOMA					WEST VIRGINIA				
Church	89	5	80	10	Eastland	53	29	57	25	Kerr	83	8	81	11	Hoblitell	63	11	-	-
Dworshak	85	15	83	17	Stennis	70	30	70	30	Monroney	74	7	74	8	Revercomb	46	37	52	32
ILLINOIS					MISSOURI					OREGON					WISCONSIN				
Douglas	90	9	82	18	Hennings	67	6	55	11	Morse	91	3	86	6	Proxmire	94	6	-	-
Dirksen	80	13	86	9	Symington	90	5	81	10	Neuberger	85	15	80	19	Wiley	57	26	62	30
INDIANA					MONTANA					PENNSYLVANIA					WYOMING				
Capehart	74	5	66	6	Monsfield	95	3	92	6	Clark	82	10	74	15	O'Mahoney	53	7	63	6
Jenner	60	8	62	11	Murray	70	5	67	5	Martin	79	2	78	5	Barrett	76	13	78	13

Democrats in this type; Republicans in *italics*

Party Unity-Opposition Scores

House Party Unity -- 1958 and 85th Congress

1. PARTY UNITY, 1958. Percentage of 37 House Party Unity roll calls in 1958 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. (Party Unity roll calls are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans.) Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
2. PARTY OPPOSITION, 1958. Percentage of 37 House Party Unity roll calls in 1958 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
3. PARTY UNITY, 85th Congress. Percentage of 96 House Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
4. PARTY OPPOSITION, 85th Congress. Percentage of 96 House Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.

Headnotes

- Not a Representative in 1957; also used for Speaker Rayburn, who does not ordinarily vote.

† Not eligible for all 59 Party Unity roll calls in 1957; percentage score is based on number of votes for which Representative was eligible.

* Not eligible for all 37 Party Unity roll calls in 1958; percentage score is based on number of votes for which Representative was eligible.

‡ Scores for 1957, when Rep. Dellay sat as a Republican.

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
ALABAMA					Los Angeles County					4 Flynt	43	54	36	50	4 Adair	81	8	74	17
3 Andrews	59	38	63	35	23 Doyle	51	5	63	6	3 Forrester	51	49	59	39	5 Beamer	81	5	53	6
1 Boykin	43	19	50	17	19 Holifield	81	14	79	14	9 Landrum	49	22	53	26	7 Bray	57	43	55	36
7 Elliott	84	14	80	13	17 King	95	5	93	5	2 Mitchell	68	24	-	-	11 Brownson	57	11	58	9
2 Grant	35	41	53	32	26 Roosevelt	78	3	80	4	2 Pilcher	51	35	68	19	2 Halleck	78	19	67	21
9 Huddleston	78	22	78	22	21 Hiestand	95	5	79	6	1 Preston	38	19	46	9	6 Harden	70	19	78	15
8 Jones	86	14	90	10	25 Hillings	30	14	41	16	6 Vinson	51	38	60	20	10 Harvey	84	16	79	11
5 Rains	57	14	71	15	22 Holt	76	11	67	20	IDAHO					3 Nimitz	68	32	76	24
4 Roberts	65	19	72	17	18 Hosmer	70	16	70	20	1 Pfozt	89	11	88	11	9 Wilson	86	8	84	10
6 Selden	65	35	70	30	16 Jackson	65	22	63	14	2 Budge	81	8	84	8	IOWA				
ARIZONA					24 Lipscomb	76	24	85	15	ILLINOIS					6 Coad	89	8	77	9
2 Udall	78	22	77	13	15 McDonough	68	32	73	22	25 Gray	92	5	80	14	5 Cunningham	51	49	56	43
1 Rhodes	57	38	61	32	20 Smith	78	19	86	10	21 Mack	89	11	80	20	3 Gross	70	22	76	15
ARKANSAS					COLORADO					24 Price	92	8	88	13	8 Hoeven	86	11	71	16
1 Gathings	65	35	58	40	4 Aspinall	95	5	73	9	16 Allen	89	11	81	14	7 Jensen	62	30	71	25
4 Harris	73	24	72	26	1 Rogers	92	5	84	13	17 Arends	73	19	70	20	4 LeCompte	54	16	68	18
5 Hays	49	16	60	16	3 Chenoweth	46	54	52	46	19 Chiperfield	97	3	81	5	1 Schwengel	76	19	67	29
2 Mills	81	19	72	28	2 Hill	73	19	73	23	14 Vacancy					2 Talle	65	11	71	20
6 Norrell	62	35	69	29	CONNECTICUT					15 Mason	57	0	54	3	KANSAS				
3 Trimble	57	11	80	7	3 Cretella	65	30	55	23	18 Michel	54	22	69	18	5 Breeding	84	11	82	10
CALIFORNIA					1 May	59	32	56	34	20 Simpson	81	19	81	18	1 Avery	32	27	56	26
2 Engle	41	5	69	7	4 Morano	46	51	42	42	22 Springer	78	22	72	25	3 George	62	30	59	25
14 Hagen	78	22	81	18	5 Patterson	35	59	41	55	23 Varsell	81	11	82	10	4 Rees	73	27	81	18
11 McFall	89	11	89	9	AL Sadlak	68	24	54	34	Chicago-Cook County					2 Scrivner	68	24	76	15
8 Miller	68	5	71	5	2 Seely-Brown	49	51	50	46	7 Libonati	92	8	-	-	6 Smith	41	22	56	25
3 Moss	86	11	89	10	DELAWARE					12 Boyle	78	22	77	23	KENTUCKY				
29 Sound	78	11	89	6	AL Haskell	65	32	64	34	1 Dawson	86	5	64	3	4 Chelf	78	16	66	23
5 Shelley	65	3	65	3	FLORIDA					8 Gordon	24	3	51	4	1 Gregory	46	8	51	11
27 Sheppard	65	3	68	8	2 Bennett	76	24	76	24	5 Kluczynski	84	14	82	14	2 Natcher	78	22	82	18
12 Sisk	81	16	88	11	4 Foscill	73	24	79	20	6 O'Brien	89	11	89	10	7 Perkins	95	5	88	10
7 Allen	46	41	49	28	7 Haley	30	70	40	58	2 O'Hara	86	14	85	15	5 Spence	59	8	70	9
6 Baldwin	41	59	46	54	5 Herlong	30	65	45	31	9 Yates	78	22	77	19	6 Watts	68	16	72	18
10 Gubser	57	32	58	28	8 Matthews	54	46	65	33	3 Byrne	78	19	82	14	3 Robison	59	35	55	30
4 Mailliard	46	49	39	31	6 Rogers	51	49	66	34	13 Church	73	27	79	21	8 Siler	62	24	59	15
1 Scudder	81	19	82	18	3 Sikes	68	32	66	26	10 Collier	70	19	78	16	LOUISIANA				
13 Teague	81	19	80	17	1 Cramer	86	8	80	14	4 Vacancy					2 Boggs	76	11	81	10
28 Utt	78	8	82	8	GEORGIA					11 Sheehan	57	22	63	20	4 Brooks	38	11	56	23
30 Wilson	57	24	54	19	8 Blitch	46	16	56	23	INDIANA					1 Hebert	46	8	41	26
9 Younger	84	16	88	11	10 Brown	68	32	78	22	8 Denton	81	14	79	19	8 Long				
					5 Davis	43	51	44	49	1 Madden	89	5	82	14					

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
6 Morrison	54	5	54	5	NEBRASKA					5 Scott	49	43	59	34	6 McMillan	49	43	53	39
5 Passman	65	22	73	16	2 Cunningham	78	16	72	26	12 Shuford	8	0	40	22	2 Riley	51	43	61	30
7 Thompson	32	5	49	15	3 Harrison	70	11	81	9	11 Whitener	49	51	55	38	1 Rivers	49	27	54	25
3 Willis	54	16	63	24	4 Miller	62	38	75	25	10 Jonas	76	22	81	17	SOUTH DAKOTA				
MAINE					1 Weaver	59	41	76	24	NORTH DAKOTA					1 McGovern	84	11	83	11
2 Coffin	76	11	79	9	NEVADA					AL Burdick	3	16	19	44	2 Berry	62	38	76	21
1 Hale	35	38	52	36	AL Boring	59	11	71	10	AL Krueger	62	32	57	17	TENNESSEE				
3 McIntire	38	22	53	27	NEW HAMPSHIRE					OHIO					6 Bass	73	11	73	21
MARYLAND					2 Bass	68	32	69	20	9 Ashley	65	22	66	26	8 Everett	73	22	-	-
4 Fallon	62	27	64	27	1 Merrow	32	65	39	56	20 Feighan	59	30	71	24	9 Davis	46	16	53	13
7 Friedel	38	5	64	10	NEW JERSEY					18 Hays	65	27	55	22	4 Ewins	70	19	69	22
3 Garkatz	78	14	77	11	11 Addonizio	76	24	77	22	19 Kirwan	73	14	81	9	3 Frazier	76	19	72	24
5 Lankford	84	16	78	14	14 Delloy	76	5	39 39 39		6 Polk	76	24	73	22	5 Loser	49	32	55	28
2 Devereux	89	11	83	16	10 Rodino	73	24	75	22	21 Vanik	51	19	67	21	7 Murray	38	49	42	43
6 Hyde	70	27	64	31	13 Sieminski	46	0	51	1	14 Ayres	54	35	66	26	2 Baker	49	43	50	32
1 Miller	89	8	75	16	4 Thompson	70	16	79	11	13 Baumbart	51	14	60	15	1 Reece	59	30	48	26
MASSACHUSETTS					3 Auchincloss	62	16	63	29	8 Betts	97	3	94	5	TEXAS				
2 Boland	65	32	71	25	8 Canfield	38	62	46	52	22 Bolton	89	8	72	20	3 Beckworth	92	8	84	16
4 Donohue	76	22	74	14	6 Dwyer	46	54	60	40	16 Bow	70	14	74	17	2 Brooks	95	5	84	16
7 Lane	78	22	78	21	5 Frelinghuysen	59	30	57	27	7 Brown	95	5	85	15	17 Burleson	62	38	65	35
8 Macdonald	49	32	54	30	2 Glenn	46	35	-	-	5 Cleverger	78	5	74	15	AL Dies	3	3	17	14
12 McCormack	84	3	76	5	12 Kean	62	30	61	26	11 Dennison	86	14	76	14	7 Dowdy	35	49	43	49
11 O'Neill	68	19	75	14	9 Osmer	41	57	52	46	15 Henderson	89	3	85	6	21 Fisher	62	35	61	36
3 Philbin	73	24	75	14	7 Widnall	57	43	56	38	2 Hess	86	14	78	14	13 Ikard	78	16	76	22
6 Bates	84	16	83	16	1 Wolverton	38	43	35	46	10 Jenkins	14	3	52	11	20 Kilday	73	22	77	20
10 Curtis	70	22	66	26	NEW MEXICO					4 McCulloch	81	0	88	3	15 Kilgore	57	41	59	40
1 Heseltin	54	41	63	35	AL Vacancy					17 Vacancy					19 Mahon	62	38	67	32
14 Martin	57	24	60	25	AL Montoya	68	8	73 73 73		23 Minsball	73	8	81	6	1 Patman	86	11	88	9
9 Nicholson	81	19	76	21	NEW YORK					3 Schenck	95	5	91	9	11 Poage	76	16	73	22
5 Rogers	41	51	41	50	30 O'Brien	65	19	60	20	1 Scherer	76	14	68	9	4 Rayburn	-	-	-	-
13 Wigglesworth	70	22	73	24	3 Becker	95	3	80	6	12 Vorys	68	22	76	19	18 Rogers	70	27	70	28
MICHIGAN					37 Robison	86	14	-	-	OKLAHOMA					16 Rutherford	70	30	69	31
12 Bennett	35	65	44	53	2 Derounian	84	3	80	6	3 Albert	89	8	84	9	6 Teague	49	14	51	22
8 Bentley	49	22	64	8	26 Dooley	41	41	60	23	2 Edmondson	86	3	85	5	8 Thomas	76	22	61	30
18 Broomfield	62	38	69	28	27 Guinn	62	3	69	4	5 Jarman	78	16	72	23	9 Thompson	86	5	78	18
10 Cederberg	92	8	93	6	32 Kearney	22	5	29	3	6 Morris	54	0	77	5	10 Thornberry	84	11	73	17
6 Chamberlain	62	30	78	19	38 Keating	73	22	77	16	4 Steed	73	8	74	14	12 Wright	92	8	83	17
5 Ford	70	27	78	21	33 Kilburn	43	3	52	5	1 Belcher	68	24	74	21	14 Young	62	16	69	21
9 Griffin	73	27	70	24	40 Miller	54	3	52	9	OREGON					5 Alger	95	5	78	9
4 Hoffman	73	5	76	6	39 Ostertag	89	11	81	14	3 Green	76	19	81	11	UTAH				
3 Johansen	89	11	90	9	42 Pillion	89	8	79	10	4 Porter	95	3	86	3	2 Dawson	68	30	66	27
11 Knox	62	32	71	26	41 Radwan	0	0	32	25	2 Ullman	92	8	93	5	1 Dixon	62	38	70	30
2 McIntosh	62	32	65	26	43 Reed	84	3	77	7	1 Norblad	70	27	67	22	VERMONT				
2 Meader	65	35	68	21	35 Rieblman	70	27	70	20	PENNSYLVANIA					AL Prouty	35	27	59	25
Detroit-Wayne County					28 St. George	76	14	78	9	25 Clark	81	19	76	18	VIRGINIA				
13 Diggs	68	8	52	14	36 Taber	97	0	92	6	28 Vacancy					4 Abbott	35	65	39	60
15 Dingell	84	11	82	15	31 Taylor	41	19	43	14	11 Flood	89	8	82	11	3 Gary	38	62	50	49
17 Griffiths	86	14	83	15	1 Wainwright	35	32	52	20	30 Holland	86	5	84	5	2 Hardy	51	38	60	35
16 Lesinski	70	8	74	11	29 Wharton	78	14	77	11	21 Dent	84	14	-	-	7 Harrison	32	62	47	51
1 Macrowicz	70	11	70	9	34 Williams	41	3	61	8	26 Morgan	89	11	81	14	9 Jennings	84	16	72	24
14 Robaut	84	16	90	10	New York City					14 Rhodes	73	27	80	20	1 Robeson	22	32	39	39
MINNESOTA					8 Anuso	73	3	58	3	15 Walter	59	22	52	17	8 Smith	38	57	44	52
8 Blatnik	68	16	77	13	24 Buckley	5	0	29	2	17 Bush	92	5	67	19	5 Tuck	32	59	39	58
9 Knutson	73	16	79	14	11 Celler	84	5	75	6	10 Carrigg	54	43	55	42	10 Broyhill	78	22	69	30
6 Marshall	46	35	64	29	7 Delaney	62	32	75	21	29 Corbett	49	51	48	47	6 Poff	92	8	89	11
4 McCarthy	65	5	71	7	23 Dollinger	81	11	81	9	8 Curtin	68	32	70	28	WASHINGTON				
3 Wier	78	16	78	20	19 Farstein	68	16	75	10	9 Dague	84	11	82	10	AL Magnuson	86	8	84	5
7 Andersen	68	19	75	19	22 Healey	86	11	78	8	12 Fenton	78	19	60	36	4 Holmes	38	62	36	64
1 Quie	71	29	-	-	6 Holtzman	73	24	31	9	27 Fulton	32	68	29	63	5 Horan	41	57	45	52
5 Judd	57	43	55	42	10 Kelly	62	35	73	20	23 Gavin	62	38	50	45	3 Mack	70	24	73	22
2 O'Hara	70	22	71	20	9 Keogh	78	5	78	7	7 James	27	0	50	6	1 Pelly	73	27	61	38
MISSISSIPPI					13 Multer	84	11	80	7	24 Kearns	51	32	44	41	6 Tollefson	43	51	42	53
1 Abernethy	54	46	59	40	16 Powell	27	11	40	5	13 Lafore	84	16	-	-	2 Westland	68	32	65	25
6 Colmer	30	19	40	35	14 Rooney	81	16	85	14	16 Mumma	89	11	86	9	WEST VIRGINIA				
3 Smith	78	22	79	20	18 Santangelo	95	0	86	3	22 Saylor	51	49	49	40	3 Bailey	70	22	70	19
2 Whitten	43	54	52	43	20 Teller	89	5	79	5	18 Simpson	81	3	74	6	6 Byrd	62	19	65	19
4 Williams	38	57	45	48	21 Zelenko	78	11	71	7	19 Stauffer	97	0	88	10	5 Kee	78	14	78	14
5 Winstead	41	27	47	39	5 Bosch	57	8	59	15	20 Van Landt	51	49	54	45	2 Stoggers	68	16	72	18
MISSOURI					17 Couderc	57	8	59	15	Philadelphia					1 Moore	59	35	63	34
5 Bolling	81	8	84	7	12 Dorn	57	43	60	35	1 Barrett	78	11	75	9	4 Neal	81	3	77	16
7 Brown	84	14	83	14	25 Fino	49	35	46	32	3 Byrne	89	11	80	10	WISCONSIN				
9 Cannon	46	46	57	40	4 Latham	70	5	70	8	4 Nix	84	16	-	-	9 Johnson	78	16	74	23
8 Canahan	57	11	63	13	15 Ray	95	5	90	10	2 Granahan	73	14	80	11	5 Reuss	78	22	76	24
4 Christopher	62	11	74	10	NORTH CAROLINA					5 Green	68	11	59	11	4 Zablocki	81	19	70	22
6 Hull	51	38	67	29	9 Alexander	43	54	52	43	6 Scott	30	38	41	39	8 Byrnes	86	11	86	13
10 Jones	43	16	57	22	3 Barden	30	35	34	30	RHODE ISLAND					7 Laird	89	11	85	6
11 Karsten	92	8	91	9	1 Bonner	54	38	67	29	2 Fogarty	65	30	60	20	10 O'Konshi	35	65	36	53
3 Sullivan	89	8	84	9	4 Cooley	65	24	65	17	1 Forand	65	19	83	10	1 Vacancy	73	27	78	22
2 Curtis	65	30	65	21	6 Durham	51	24	57	24	SOUTH CAROLINA					2 Tewes	86	14	79	13
MONTANA					2 Fountain	65	35	69	31	4 Ashmore	49	49	51	48	6 Van Pelt	43	51	53	42
2 Anderson	65	5	61	6	8 Kitchin	49	49	60	38	3 Dorn	62	38	50	39	3 Withrow	43	51	53	42
1 Metcalf	86	11	90	8	7 Lennon	51	35	48	38	5 Hemphill	62	38	50	39	WYOMING				
															AL Thomson	68	32	75	25

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

REPORTED CAMPAIGN SPENDING HITS \$3.5 MILLION MARK

Forty-one organizations reported receiving \$3,678,064.11 and spending \$3,453,434.11 for political campaigns from Jan. 1 through Aug. 31, 1958. The reports were filed with the Clerk of the House as required by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The act requires reports to be filed between the first and 10th day of March, June and September. Another report must be filed between 10 and 15 days before election and still another five days before election.

As in prior years, Republicans led Democrats in both receipts and spending. But the percentage of funds received and spent by Republican organizations was lower for the first three reporting periods in 1958 than in the last non-Presidential election year -- 1954. The percentage of total funds received and spent by Democratic organizations and labor groups was about the same as in 1954. The percentage of receipts and expenditures by independent political groups rose sharply. A comparison of the proportion of total receipts and spending by the various categories of political groups for all of 1954, and the first eight months of 1958 shows:

	Proportion of Total			
	1958		1954	
	Receipts	Spending	Receipts	Spending
GOP groups	49.3%	48.7%	54%	53%
Dem. groups	21.3	21.7	22	22
Labor groups	20	20.2	19	20
Misc. groups	9.4	9.4	5	5

The following spending reports are inclusive from Jan. 1, 1958, to Aug. 31, 1958, unless otherwise indicated in parentheses. Funds which were not identified as direct 1958 receipts and disbursements, such as carry-over funds from 1957 and U.S. Treasury bill transactions, were not included in the totals. (For 1957 receipts and spending, see Weekly Report p. 183, 495; earlier 1958 campaign spending reports, p. 815; 1956 campaign spending, 1957 Almanac p. 187; proposed revisions of Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1957 Almanac p. 652.)

Democratic Groups

Six Democratic groups reported receiving \$783,418.03, or 21.3 percent of the total receipts, between Jan. 1 and Aug. 31, 1958. They reported spending \$750,919.78, or 21.7 percent of the total, during that period. The breakdown:

Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee -- Received \$24,726.15; spent \$10,000.00.

Democratic National Committee -- Received \$626,182.63; spent \$628,602.98.

Democratic National Congressional Committee -- Received \$36,699.49; spent \$19,948.66.

Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee -- Received \$84,031.66; spent \$76,339.60.

District of Columbia Committee for McCarthy and Proxmire -- Received \$11,800.00; spent \$11,533.63.

Young Democratic Clubs of America (to May 31) -- Received \$8.10 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$8,269.96); spent \$4,494.91.

Republican Groups

Twelve Republican groups reported receiving \$1,812,521.32, or 49.3 percent of the total receipts. They reported spending \$1,681,970, or 48.7 percent of the total. The breakdown:

National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon, 1958 Committee, NYC -- Received \$32,499.79 (does not include \$409,967.16 from the sale of U.S. Treasury bills); spent \$56,949.05 (does not include \$378,541.48 for purchase of U.S. Treasury bills).

National Federation of Republican Women (to May 31) -- Received \$20,692.44; spent \$11,125.17.

National Republican Congressional Committee -- Received \$351,296.15; spent \$352,256.19.

National Republican Senatorial Committee -- Received \$141,859.64; spent \$133,403.98.

Republican Finance Committee of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pa. -- Received \$175,944.33 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$28,012.50 or \$75,000.00 in proceeds from sale of U.S. Treasury bills); spent \$151,294.04.

Republican National Committee -- Received \$723,743.49; spent \$732,655.47.

Republican State Committee of Delaware, Wilmington, Del. -- Received \$63,671.17 (does not include 1957 carryover of \$55,481.98); spent \$37,478.93.

Republican State Committee of Wyoming (to April 1) -- Received \$140.00; spent \$87.05.

Salute to Eisenhower, New York State (to March 11) -- Received \$106,918.00; spent \$21,361.27. (Excess distributed as follows: \$42,788.11 to the New York Republican State Committee; \$33,889.26 to the Republican National Finance Committee; \$1,777.45 to the National Republican Senatorial Committee; \$7,111.41 to the Republican National Congressional Committee.)

United Republican Finance Committee, NYC (to Aug. 29) -- Received \$159,846.12 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$77,632.10 or \$30,000 repayment of advance given to Salute to Eisenhower, New York State); spent \$137,088.92.

United Republican Finance Committee of San Mateo County, Burlingame, Calif. (to May 31) -- Received \$35,038.90 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$2,920.93); spent \$32,919.37.

Young Republican National Campaign Committee -- Received \$871.29 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$18,301.08); spent \$5,683.35.

Labor Organizations

Fifteen labor organizations reported receiving \$734,606.56, or 20 percent of the total. They reported spending \$696,592.63, or 20.2 percent of the total. The breakdown:

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (AFL-CIO) Political Education Committee, NYC (to Sept. 2) -- Received \$20,212.23; spent \$7,004.63.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen's (Ind.) Political Education League, Cleveland, Ohio -- Received \$12,055.21 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$3,639.14); spent \$12,204.53.

Committee on Political Education, AFL-CIO -- Received \$256,273.91; spent \$293,419.53.

Committee on Political Education, Communications Workers of America (AFL-CIO) -- Received \$14,328.53; spent \$6,350.00.

International Assn. of Machinists Non-Partisan Political League (AFL-CIO) -- Received \$26,780.72 in general fund; \$48,619.05 in educational fund. Total receipts: \$75,339.77. Spent \$24,951.86 out of general fund; \$47,778.77 out of educational fund. Total expenditures: \$72,730.63.

International Assn. of Machinists Non-Partisan Political League (AFL-CIO), Chapter 311, Los Angeles, Calif. -- Received \$3,271.05; spent \$1,910.45.

International Assn. of Machinists Non-Partisan Political League (AFL-CIO) of Automotive Lodge 1186, Los Angeles, Calif. -- Received \$218.00; spent \$98.00.

International Assn. of Machinists Non-Partisan Political League (AFL-CIO), Santa Monica, Calif. -- Received \$1,662.00; spent \$732.50.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL-CIO) -- Received \$21,488.12; spent, \$9,544.50.

Kansas Committee on Political Education (AFL-CIO) (to June 3) -- Received \$1,332.70 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$2,169.45); spent \$146.00.

Railway Labor Executives Assn. (Ind.) Political League -- Received \$31,951.62; spent \$28,030.00.

Textile Workers Union of America (AFL-CIO) NYC -- Received \$4,972.03; spent \$8,112.70.

United Auto Workers (AFL-CIO), Political Action Committee CIO, Detroit, Mich. (to Sept. 15) -- Received \$195,018.05; spent \$205,227.75. (Account closed out Sept. 15, 1958.)

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America (AFL-CIO), Non-Partisan Committee, Indianapolis, Ind., -- Received nothing, (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$7,464.55); spent \$500.

United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO) Voluntary Political Action Fund, Pittsburgh, Pa., -- Received \$96,423.34; spent \$50,582.01.

Miscellaneous Groups

Ten miscellaneous organizations reported receiving \$347,518.84, or 9.4 percent of the total. They reported spending \$323,951.64, or 9.4 percent of the total. The breakdown:

A Clean Political Appeal, NYC, (special account of the National Committee for an Effective Congress), (June 10 to Sept. 15) -- Received \$23,068.52; spent \$19,697.83.

Americans for Democratic Action -- Received \$85,824.23 in regular account; \$31,996.00 in non-political account. Total receipts: \$117,820.23. Spent \$87,023.44 out of regular account; \$32,596.18 out of non-political account. Total spending: \$119,619.62.

Christian Nationalist Crusade, Los Angeles, Calif. -- Received \$139,374.44; spent \$115,449.73.

Crescent Bay Non-Partisan League, Santa Monica, Calif. -- Received \$368.00; spent \$250.20.

For America -- Received \$23,335.48; spent \$23,812.69.

Good Government National Committee, NYC -- Received nothing (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$127.74); spent \$5.12.

National Assn. of Pro-America, San Francisco, Calif. -- Received \$3,219.44; spent \$3,383.71.

National Committee for an Effective Congress, NYC -- Received \$35,347.58; spent \$36,474.84.

No Tax - No War Committee, Wilmington, Del. -- Received \$6.25 (does not include 1957 carry-over of \$3.10); spent \$6.15.

Pro America, California Chapter, Riverside, Calif. -- Received \$4,979.00; spent \$5,256.87.

Campaign Spending Law

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 has been under heavy attack for years on grounds its loopholes prevent the public from learning how much actually is spent in election campaigns. These are among its most controversial provisions:

ELECTIONS -- The act does not cover primary elections or nominating conventions.

Critics say this is a big omission since primaries and conventions are the most important and expensive contests in several states.

POLITICAL COMMITTEES -- The act defines political committees as those operating in two or more states, unless they are branches of such national committees as the Democratic National Committee.

Critics say this gives the public no idea of how much money goes to candidates through state committees which are not covered by the act. Some states require their political committees to file campaign spending reports. But in most states the reports are not filed in any one place and there is little standardization in reporting requirements.

SPENDING LIMITS -- The act limits campaign spending in any one year to \$25,000 for Senators, \$5,000 for Representatives and \$3 million for political committees coming under the act. Individual contributions are limited to \$5,000. The majority of the Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee in its 1957 report on the 1956 general election campaign said the limits were unrealistic. It added that the legality of funneling campaign money through state committees makes the limits "meaningless."

BUSINESS AND LABOR ACTIVITY -- The act forbids corporations and "any labor organization" to contribute to campaigns of candidates for national office.

The majority of the Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee said "existing statutory provisions are inadequate." It pointed to labor unions which contribute money to political campaigns, despite the law. The AFL-CIO unions, for example, give their members' voluntary contributions to political candidates. Also, AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education spends money on "political education."

1957 PROPOSAL

The Senate Rules and Administration Committee Aug. 2, 1957, reported a bill (S 2150 -- S Rept 792) to overhaul the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

S 2150 would have increased the spending limits for national committees from \$3 million to about \$12 million a year under a formula based on 20 cents a vote multiplied by the number of persons who voted in the last Presidential election.

It would have increased the spending limits for Senate candidates from \$25,000 to \$50,000 and for House candidates from \$5,000 to \$12,500, or an amount equal to 20 cents a vote for all votes cast for the office in the preceding general election plus 10 cents a vote for all such votes over one million.

The proposed law also would have covered primaries, nominating conventions, party caucuses and all committees which spent \$1,000 a year. S 2150 did not come up for a vote in either the Senate or House. (1957 Almanac p. 652)

WESTERN STATES' POLITICAL OUTLOOK

This is the last of four regional stories on the outlook for the 1958 election. The first, dealing with the Southern states, appeared on Weekly Report p. 1235; the second, dealing with the Eastern states, on Weekly Report p. 1287; the third, dealing with the Midwestern states, on Weekly Report p. 1320.

This article deals with Alaska, which votes Nov. 25, and the 11 Western states -- Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

The political stakes in the 11 Western states this year are shown in the table below:

	Held By	
	Democrats	Republicans
Governorships	3	5
Senate seats	3	5
House seats	26*	31*

*Vacancies credited to party last holding seat.

In addition to these, Alaska will elect a Governor, two Senators and a Representative.

In 1956, President Eisenhower carried every state in the West, as he had in 1952. But Democrats made a net gain of one governorship (gaining Oregon and Washington, but losing New Mexico), picked up two Senate seats (in Idaho and Colorado) and gained six House seats (two each in California and Oregon, plus single seats in Nevada and Montana).

Party organization, as such, probably means less in the West than in any other section of the country. In California, it is true, a real top-to-bottom Democratic sweep seems to be in the making. But in the smaller states, local issues and, particularly, personal popularity count for more than any national trend. Generalizations about the region, therefore, are dangerous, but here is how the individual races add up:

Governors -- Democrats should hold Arizona and Colorado, gain Alaska. But they may lose Oregon. Republicans almost certainly will lose California. They should retain Idaho, New Mexico and Wyoming, with Nevada in doubt. Net: A standoff except for Alaska.

Senate -- Democrats should hold Montana, New Mexico and Washington seats without difficulty. Republicans will probably lose California. Their Nevada and Arizona seats are in doubt. They are slight favorites in Utah and Wyoming. The two new Alaska seats probably will split. Net: A Democratic gain of at least one seat.

House -- In the West as a whole, Democrats have far fewer shaky seats to defend than the Republicans. They can look for almost certain gains in California and Washington, should pick up the new Alaska seat. Democrats should make a net gain of at least four seats in those three states alone. Other opportunities in California, Colorado, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming could boost their take to 12, but the total probably won't go that high.

Alaska

Alaska will vote Nov. 25.

Governor -- Leans Democratic. William A. Egan (D), 44, of Valdez vs. John Butrovich Jr. (R), 48, of Fairbanks.

Egan is a native of Valdez, a former mayor of that city and a veteran of five terms in the territorial house of representatives and one in the territorial senate. He was one of the two "Senators" elected in Alaska in 1956 to come to Washington and lobby for statehood. He was also president of the state constitutional convention.

Butrovich is a native of Fairbanks, where he conducts an insurance business, and a member of a pioneer mining family. He has been in the territorial senate for 14 years, serving as chairman of the finance committee part of that time. He is chairman of the Governor's tax advisory committee.

Although Republicans have shown occasional strength in Alaskan voting, capturing both houses of the territorial legislature in 1946 and again in 1952, the territory has been predominantly Democratic in its voting habits. In 1956, for instance, the voters elected 21 Democrats and 3 Republicans to the territorial house, 11 Democrats and five Republicans to the territorial senate.

The results of the Aug. 26 "popularity poll" primary also indicated Democratic strength. In the gubernatorial race, three Democratic candidates polled 37,097 votes (22,670 of them for Egan), while Butrovich, unopposed, drew 9,656 votes.

The outcome of the general election is not expected to be that one-sided. Without a statehood referendum to draw casual voters, the total vote is expected to be smaller than that in the primary. But big vote or small, Egan is given a clear edge.

Senator -- Alaska will elect two Senators, designated by Term A and Term B. The lengths of the terms will be determined by lot by the Senate, when the two men are sworn in.

Term A -- Safe Democratic. Delegate E.L. (Bob) Bartlett (D), 54, of Juneau vs. R.E. Robertson (R), 72 of Juneau.

Bartlett, a native of Seattle who moved to Alaska in 1905, was appointed territorial secretary in 1939. He was elected as the territory's lone Delegate to the House in 1944 and has been reelected every two years since then. His closest election was in 1952, when he received 56.6 percent of the vote. In 1956, he won 67 percent of the vote.

Robertson, who has lived in Alaska for 52 years, is a former three-term mayor of Juneau, where he practices law. He has also served as trustee of the University of Alaska.

Bartlett is considered by both parties as the top vote-getter in Alaska. Neither man had opposition in the Aug. 26 primary, and Bartlett outdrew Robertson, 38,028 to 8,004.

Term B -- Leans Republican. Former Gov. Mike Stepovich (R), 39, of Fairbanks vs. former Gov. Ernest Gruening (D), 71, of Juneau.

Stepovich, a native of Fairbanks and a graduate of Notre Dame, set up law practice in Fairbanks in 1948, was elected city attorney in 1949, a member of the territorial house of representatives in 1950 and a territorial senator in 1952 and 1956. He was appointed Governor in June 1957 by President Eisenhower, on recommendation from Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton. He resigned Aug. 1 to make the Senate race.

Gruening, a native of New York City, moved to Alaska in 1939 when he was appointed Governor by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Gruening is a graduate of Harvard Medical School who reached the governorship after editing "The Nation" and heading the Interior Department's Division of Territories during Roosevelt's first administration. He remained as Governor until 1953, putting the stamp of his own liberal political philosophies on the territory through such legislation as the bill ending segregation of Eskimos in schools and public places. He was the other "Senator" elected in 1956.

This Senate race looks like the best contest in Alaska. Stepovich is regarded as the most appealing politician in the Republican camp, and the GOP will go all-out to secure him a Senate seat. Secretary Seaton, who worked hard to make Stepovich the hero of the successful fight for statehood, already is booked for campaign appearances on his behalf.

Democrats will do no less for Gruening, partly in appreciation of his past services and partly to block the start of any tradition of splitting the Senate seats between the parties.

Both men have personal followings that cross party lines. Gruening, who is Jewish, has fought the statehood fight since 1934, and his efforts in behalf of the territory are well-known, particularly to the old settlers. Stepovich, who is Catholic, may have greater appeal to the young voters (including the 19- and 20-year-olds), and to those who have moved to Alaska since the end of World War II. Stepovich has strong campaign assets in his youth and in his claim that it would be prudent to include at least one Republican in the Congressional delegation when the Administration is Republican.

The battle may be close, but Stepovich rates the edge on the basis of his 25,741 to 20,278-vote edge over Gruening in the primary.

Representative-at-large -- Leans Democratic. Ralph J. Rivers (D), 55, of Juneau vs. Henry A. Benson (R), 48, of Juneau.

Rivers, who has lived in Alaska all but three years of his life, is an attorney. He was a U.S. Attorney in the territory from 1933 to 1944, the territorial attorney general from 1945 to 1949, mayor of Fairbanks from 1952 to 1954, a territorial senator in 1955. He was elected as "Representative" in the 1956 mock election. Rivers won a narrow 438-vote victory over Raymond E. Plummer in this year's Democratic primary.

Benson, who has lived in Alaska for 28 years, is the territorial labor commissioner.

The edge in the race goes to Rivers, who outpolled Benson, 17,607 to 10,212 in the primary. The second Democrat polled another 17,169 votes.

Arizona

Governor -- Leans Democratic. Attorney General Robert Morrison (D), 49, of Phoenix vs. Paul Fannin (R), 51, of Phoenix for the seat of retiring Gov. Ernest W. McFarland (D).

Morrison, a former Pima County (Tucson) state's attorney, is completing his second term as state attorney general. He received slightly less than 50 percent of the total vote in the three-man field in the September Democratic primary, defeating his closest rival by about 20,000 votes.

Fannin is a wealthy bottled gas distributor who is making his first political race. He was unopposed in the September primary.

Most signs in the state point to continued Democratic occupancy of the governorship, which the party has held for the past four years. The state's registration is 69 percent Democratic and Morrison is far better known than his political novice opponent. He has the endorsement of organized labor.

The element of doubt in the situation is the aftermath of the bitter Democratic primary. Morrison was the target of a series of articles in the state's largest paper, the Phoenix Arizona Republic. They charged that Morrison, born Berj Mozekian, had served jail terms on bad check charges and had deserted a wife and daughter in California before moving to Arizona, changing his name, divorcing and remarrying and taking up a career as an attorney.

Morrison's primary victory convinced his backers that the personal charges against him had backfired. Republicans have not repeated the charges in the general election campaign, but they hope for a sizable defection to Fannin on the part of the majority of Democrats who voted against Morrison in the primary.

Senator -- Doubtful. Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (R), 49, vs. Gov. Ernest W. McFarland (D), 64.

This is a rerun of the 1952 contest. Goldwater, a Phoenix department store owner who helped lead the 1950 Republican revival in Arizona, defeated McFarland, who then was the incumbent Senator, by 6,725 votes in 1952 while President Eisenhower was carrying the state by 43,514. In the Senate, Goldwater has frequently been at odds with the Eisenhower Administration. He has written a conservative record, with particular emphasis on demands for strong legislative action to curb what he describes as "abuses" of union power. He is best known nationally for his long-continued feud with United Auto Workers President Walter P. Reuther.

McFarland, an attorney, was first elected to the Senate in 1940 and won reelection in 1946 with 70 percent of the vote. He was listed in the conservative Democratic camp in those days and was elected Senate Majority Leader in the 82nd Congress (1951-52). After his defeat by Goldwater, McFarland registered as a \$2,500-a-month lobbyist for Western Union, RCA Communications Inc. and American Cable and Radio Corp.

He returned to Arizona politics in 1954, defeating incumbent Gov. Howard Pyle (R) for reelection by 12,238 votes. In 1956, McFarland himself gained reelection by 55,104 votes, running almost 60,000 votes ahead of the national Democratic ticket.

He was nominated for the Senate this year by a 2½-to-1 margin over Democratic National Committeeman Stephen W. Langmade.

Although Goldwater has put great emphasis on his own labor policies in this campaign, McFarland has not centered his own campaign on that particular issue. With the endorsement and all-out support of organized labor and his opponent's record on the subject, McFarland does not have to strain to win the "labor vote." That vote by itself is not large enough to swing the election, anyway,

and undue emphasis on that issue might well cost McFarland support in a state that was one of the first in the country to pass a right-to-work law. Instead, McFarland has chosen to emphasize his service to Arizona during his terms as Senator and Governor on water problems, industrial development, Indian affairs and a broad range of other local interests. His own personal popularity is enhanced by the endorsement he has received in this campaign from the state's respected senior Senator, Carl Hayden (D).

Goldwater, who pilots his own plane around the state for campaign appearances, has appealed to Arizona voters to endorse his record as an "independent, unbossed" Senator. In normally Democratic Arizona, he has noted the fact that he has opposed not only the "labor bosses" but the Eisenhower Administration as well. Unlike Republican campaigners in other states, Goldwater does not have a recession to contend with. The general economy has been prosperous, and even the ailing mining industry has perked up in recent weeks.

With the heavy Democratic registration edge, Goldwater's chances depend almost entirely on his ability to woo conservative Democratic votes away from McFarland. His chances of doing that were boosted by the bitter primary campaign waged against McFarland by Langmade. Langmade accused McFarland of sacrificing the state's copper and water interests in several Senate votes and aired charges of scandal in land acquisition "deals" during McFarland's administration as Governor.

Langmade also stressed the fact, first disclosed during the McClellan Committee hearings, that McFarland's last gubernatorial campaign benefited from a \$4,000 Teamsters check, which was not reported in accordance with Arizona law.

Goldwater has estimated that he needs 30 percent of the Democratic vote and 90 percent of the Republican vote to win. Langmade received slightly less than 30 percent of the Democratic primary vote, and not all those people may be willing to cross over and vote for Goldwater. Organized labor is going all out for McFarland's election. Most recent polls give McFarland a slight, but inconclusive edge.

But Arizona's remarkable population growth has brought such an influx of new residents that perhaps 25 percent of this year's voters will be people who did not participate in the 1952 McFarland-Goldwater race. This fact, plus the other impossibilities in the contest, make the outcome almost impossible to predict.

House -- Democrats and Republicans each hold one seat. The Democrat is safe and the Republican is favored, though challenged.

1st District (Phoenix and Maricopa County) -- Three-term Rep. John J. Rhodes (R) is opposed by State Sen. Joe C. Haldiman Jr. (D). Rhodes won by 14,193 votes in 1956. Haldiman won a narrow and bitterly contested primary victory over ex-Rep. Richard F. Harless (D) (1943-49), who had labor backing. At first Haldiman appeared no threat to Rhodes, but he now has won support from many elements that opposed him in the primary. The Haldiman name is well-known in the state, and he is given at least an outside chance to upset Rhodes if McFarland beats Goldwater.

2nd District (Tucson and the rest of the state) -- Two-term Rep. Stewart L. Udall (D) is considered a certain winner over John G. Speiden (R), who was beaten by 27,154 votes in 1956.

California

Governor -- Safe Democratic. Sen. William F. Knowland (R), 50, vs. Attorney General Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, 53, for the seat of retiring Gov. Goodwin J. Knight (R).

Knowland, who was appointed to the Senate in 1945, elected in 1946 and reelected in 1952 after winning both party nominations, announced his plans to retire from the Senate early in 1957. Later that year, he declared himself a candidate for the gubernatorial nomination against incumbent Gov. Knight. Knight later responded to urging from Vice President Richard M. Nixon and other high party leaders and withdrew from the gubernatorial primary to seek Knowland's Senate seat.

Brown, a former San Francisco district attorney, was the only Democrat to win statewide office (attorney general) in the 1950 Republican sweep. He was reelected without difficulty in 1954, announced for the governorship late in 1957 and had only token opposition in the primary.

The signs all point to a substantial victory for Brown. Democrats have about a 3-2 edge in registration, and their advantage in new registrations (since the June primary) is even greater.

Brown can count on the all-out support of organized labor, which has made a maximum effort in the state this year in order to defeat the right-to-work referendum.

Democrats are united behind Brown, while Republican party cohesion has been shattered, first by Knowland's entry into the gubernatorial race and second by his endorsement of the right-to-work proposition as the key issue in his campaign.

Brown received 58 percent of the total vote in the primary; Knowland, 42 percent. The latest California Poll gives Brown 56 percent of the vote and Knowland 34 percent, with 10 percent undecided.

Senator -- Leans Democratic. Gov. Goodwin J. Knight (R), 61, vs. Rep. Clair Engle (D), 47, of Red Bluff for the seat of retiring Sen. William F. Knowland (R).

Knight was lieutenant governor in 1953 and succeeded Gov. Earl Warren (R) when Warren resigned to become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He was elected to his first full term in 1954 with a 551,151-vote plurality, announced for reelection last year, then withdrew to clear the way for Knowland's candidacy. He defeated San Francisco Mayor George Christopher (R) in the June Senatorial primary.

Engle, who has represented the vast but lightly populated 2nd District, which stretches almost the full length of the state's eastern border, since 1943, is giving up a safe House seat and the chairmanship of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to make his first statewide race. He was unopposed for the Senatorial nomination.

In the June primary, Engle won 46.4 percent of the total vote, Knight 31.8 percent and Christopher, the other Republican, 21.8 percent.

The Senate race is not as one-sided as the governorship, but Engle seems to have a decided edge. He should benefit from Brown's coattails and the general Democratic edge in registration, organization and morale. He has a considerable personal following in the northern part of the state.

Knight, on the other hand, is the better-known of the two candidates, with a particularly strong following in populous Los Angeles County. He has followed the liberal Republican policies of his predecessor, Gov. Warren, and has support in both labor and business circles.

The state CIO has endorsed Engle, who once was in labor's doghouse for voting for the Taft-Hartley Act. But the much larger AFL, which backed Knight for Governor four years ago, has endorsed both Knight and Engle in this race.

Knight has been at pains to disassociate himself from Knowland's campaign for Governor, has hinted he might vote for Brown himself and has made clear his opposition to the right-to-work referendum.

This stand may win him independent support, but it puts him in danger of a Republican cross-fire. Knowland backers may take it out on Knight for his refusal to back their candidate. He also faces antagonism from backers of San Francisco's Mayor Christopher, who were bitter about Knight's last-minute decision to enter the Senate race against their candidate.

The latest California Poll gives Engle 49 percent of the vote and Knight 38 percent, with 13 percent undecided.

House -- Democrats hold 13 seats; Republicans, 17. Democrats are expected to capture one Republican seat (1st). Another GOP seat is doubtful (7th) and five others are threatened (6th, 15th, 21st, 25th, 30th). One Democratic seat is threatened (29th).

1st District (North Coast) -- Five-term Rep. Hubert B. Scudder (R) is retiring. Clement W. Miller (D), who received 46.4 percent of the vote against Scudder in 1956, vs. Frederick G. Dupuis (R). Miller outpolled Dupuis personally by a 2-1 margin in the primary, and Democrats had a 3-2 edge over Republicans in total vote. This is the best chance for a Democratic gain.

7th District (Oakland, Alameda County -- Six-term Rep. John J. Allen (R) vs. Jeffery Cohelan (D), Berkeley councilman. Allen won by only 8,001 votes in 1956, led Cohelan, a new Democratic candidate, by only 1,600 votes in the June primary. This is Knowland's home district, but that will not necessarily help Allen this November. Cohelan is an anti-Hoffa Teamster business agent. Both parties call it doubtful.

6th District (West Central) -- Two-term Rep. John F. Baldwin Jr. (R) vs. Howard H. Jewel (D). This is a normally Democratic district that went for Adlai E. Stevenson in both his Presidential campaigns. Baldwin won by 2,560 votes in 1954 over incumbent Rep. Robert L. Condon (D), who had been tagged as a security risk by the Atomic Energy Commission. Baldwin upped his margin in 1956 to 13,718 votes, despite Stevenson's victory in the district. Jewel is a new candidate, with no connections with past Democratic troubles in the district, but Baldwin has shown unusual ability to entrench himself in what might, for the average Republican, be hostile territory.

15th District (Los Angeles County) -- Seven-term Rep. Gordon L. McDonough (R) vs. Emery S. Petty (D), who was defeated by 26,501 votes in 1956. Population changes, plus increased Democratic registrations, give Petty a chance in this rematch, but McDonough is favored.

21st District (Los Angeles County) -- Three-term Rep. Edgar W. Hiestand (R) vs. Rudd Brown (D), granddaughter of William Jennings Bryan. Mrs. Brown, aided by Stevenson, has been conducting a vigorous campaign in this suburban area, aided by growing Democratic organization strength. Hiestand has built his margin from 15,093 votes in 1952 to a fat 61,996 votes in 1956. He led comfortably in the primary, too, and is favored for reelection.

25th District (Los Angeles County) -- George A. Kasem (D) vs. Prescott O. Lieberg (R). Four-term Rep. Patrick J. Hillings (R), who took over this district from Vice President Nixon, is retiring to run for state attorney general. The district has been safe Republican territory in the last three elections, but Lieberg had only a 5,000-vote lead over Kasem in the primary. Democrats now lead in registration for the first time.

30th District (San Diego County) -- Three-term Rep. Bob Wilson (R) vs. Lionel Van Deerlin (D), television news commentator. Wilson won by 71,641 votes in 1956 but led Van Deerlin by only 10,000 votes in the primary. Democrats have made great registration gains here and Van Deerlin is regarded as the strongest candidate they have thrown against Wilson.

29th District (Southwest) -- Freshman Rep. D.S. Saund (D) vs. John Babbage (R). Saund, a native of India, won an upset 3,299-vote victory over the badly divided GOP in 1956. He has a smaller registration edge in his favor than any other Democratic incumbent, probably must lead the Democratic ticket in his district to win. Babbage has at least partially patched some of the local GOP feuds, is making an energetic campaign. But Saund's personal following, plus the apparent statewide Democratic trend, gives the incumbent the edge.

Democrats are regarded as certain to hold the 2nd District seat Engle is vacating to run for the Senate. In the 11th District, which is statistically doubtful, freshman Rep. John J. McFall (D) almost won both nominations, is rated a cinch for reelection.

Colorado

Governor -- Leans Democratic. Gov. Stephen L.R. McNichols (D), 44, vs. State Rep. Palmer L. Burch (R), 51, of Denver.

McNichols, a protege of former Sen. and Gov. Edwin C. Johnson (D), in 1956 became the first Catholic Governor in the history of Colorado. He moved up from lieutenant governor by defeating Donald G. Brotzman (R) by 17,333 votes while President Eisenhower carried the state by 129,482 votes. He was unopposed for renomination.

Burch, a Denver businessman, has served five terms in the state house of representatives and has been chairman of the appropriations and finance committees and the legislative council. He is making his first statewide race after gaining the nomination without opposition.

Burch has pitched his campaign on criticism of the fiscal policies of McNichols' administration, a field on which he is an expert, but neither his personality nor his chosen issue has seemed to catch fire. McNichols, is a strong favorite to win the first four-year Governor's term in Colorado history.

Three special factors seem to be working in his favor:

1 -- Organized labor is making an all-out effort to defeat a right-to-work referendum, and is given a good chance of success. Both McNichols and Burch have come out against right-to-work, but McNichols has the important labor endorsements and should benefit most from the union effort.

2 -- A larger-than-usual turnout of Catholic voters is expected because of the referendum on legalizing bingo and raffles conducted by churches and other non-profit groups. This vote, too, is expected to boost McNichols.

3 -- The candidacy of Charles Vigil for attorney general on the Democratic ticket is expected to draw unusual Mexican-American support for the ticket.

Senator -- No election.

House -- Republicans and Democrats each hold two seats. Both Democratic seats (1st and 4th) seem safe; both Republican seats (2nd and 3rd) doubtful.

2nd District (Northeast) -- Former State Rep. Byron L. Johnson (D) vs. State Rep. John G. Mackie (R) for the seat of retiring Rep. William S. Hill (R). Hill held this district for the GOP for 18 years, beating Johnson by 13,581 votes in 1956. Hill's departure weakens the GOP, but Mackie showed good vote-pulling strength in defeating a strong opponent in the primary. With crops good this year, he should have the edge in this normally Republican district. Johnson's chances may depend on how far McNichols' coattails stretch.

3rd District (Southeast) -- Rep. J. Edgar Chenoweth (R) vs. Fred M. Betz (D), Lamar publisher. Chenoweth has held this seat since 1940, except for a narrow defeat in 1948. He won by only 695 votes in 1956, and this year, too, this race looks to be the closest in the state. Chenoweth, a popular campaigner, has been blamed for the failure of Congress to approve the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project. Betz, the former state chairman, is making his first race in the district after winning a very close primary fight. The aftermath of that fight may cost him some support in Pueblo, chief Democratic center in the district, and the extent of that defection could determine the outcome of the race.

Idaho

Governor -- Leans Republican. Gov. Robert E. Smylie (R), 43, vs. State Sen. A.M. Derr (D) of Clarks Fork.

Smylie was unopposed for nomination to a second four-year term. He was elected with a 19,391-vote plurality in 1954.

Derr won a narrow, 133-vote victory over his closest competitor in the four-man Democratic primary field in August. He received slightly less than one-third of the total Democratic vote.

The chief issue in the campaign is Derr's proposal to legalize gambling, by local option, in Idaho. His stand was not endorsed by the Democratic state convention and he himself has sought to play it down a bit in this campaign, but it is credited with winning him the nomination.

There is latent support for the proposal in northern Idaho and in the border towns which see the possibility of attracting business from Washington, Oregon, Montana and Wyoming or, in the case of the southern border, of holding onto some cash that now goes into gambling wheels in Nevada.

Others see the gambling proposal as a way of avoiding tax increases, and they believe it may win Derr votes from people who would not ordinarily back a Democratic candidate. On the other hand, the proposal is opposed by the Allied Civic Forces, who, with their ties to the clergy, make up a powerful force in the state.

The other important factor in the race is the right-to-work referendum. This has not become a partisan issue, but when organized labor makes a major effort in a state, it usually is the Democratic candidates who benefit. Idaho always turns out a big vote relative to its population, however, so the union registration drive may not be as dramatic in its results here as it has been in other states.

There is some defection from Smylie on the Republican side, but it is not comparable to the split Derr's

nomination caused in the Democratic party. That fact, plus the uncertain appeal of the legalized gambling issue, gives Smylie the edge for reelection.

Senator -- No election.

House -- Each party holds one seat. The Democrat is safe; the Republican is challenged but favored.

1st District (North) -- Three-term Rep. Gracie Pfoost (D), who won by 11,196 votes in 1956, is considered a sure winner over Mayor A.B. Curtis (R) of Orofino.

2nd District (South) -- Four-term Rep. Hamer H. Budge (R) is challenged by State Rep. J. Tim Brennan (D), 27, of Boise. Brennan won the four-man Democratic primary with the endorsement of organized labor, and labor regulation is the chief issue in the campaign. Budge probably lost some votes by hinting earlier that he might not seek reelection this year and by voting against an appropriation for an atomic reactor at Arco, in the district. But his 30,186-vote edge in 1956 makes him the favorite.

Montana

Governor -- No election.

Senator -- Safe Democratic. Sen. Mike Mansfield (D), 55, vs. Lou W. Welch (R), 31, Anaconda smelter worker.

Mansfield, who was elected by a narrow 5,749 votes in 1952, was considered such a strong candidate this year that no Republican of political stature would run against him. He is rated a certain winner over his unknown opponent.

House -- Democrats hold both seats. Rep. Lee Metcalf in the western 1st District is safe. The vast, eastern 2nd District is doubtful.

2nd District -- Freshman Rep. LeRoy Anderson (D) opposes Ashton Jones (R), 59, former state GOP chairman and a retired publisher. Anderson, a National Guard general and former state senator, upset Rep. Orvin B. Fjare (R) by 2,641 votes in 1956, after losing to him by 1,608 votes in 1954. Key issue in the 1956 race was Anderson's opposition to the President's veto of a \$5 million payment to Crow Indians for land taken from them to build the Yellowstone Dam. The President this year signed a bill approving a \$2.5 million payment to the Indians.

Republicans say Jones, who has carried on a hard-hitting campaign and is well-known throughout the district, will beat Anderson. They charge Anderson with absenteeism and claim he has not entrenched himself well in the district. Democrats admit concern, but think that with Mansfield at the top of the ticket, Anderson will be all right.

Nevada

Governor -- Doubtful. Gov. Charles H. Russell (R), 54, vs. Grant Sawyer (D), 39, Elko district attorney.

Russell is seeking his third four-year term as Governor. He was elected in 1950 by 9,445 votes, re-elected in 1954 by 4,868 votes. He was renominated without opposition in September.

Sawyer, a former state Democratic chairman, scored something of an upset in the primary when he defeated Attorney General Harvey Dickerson of Las Vegas by a 3-2 margin. Dickerson was backed by E.L. Cord, a wealthy industrialist who has taken an unsteady grip on Democratic affairs in the state.

Russell is bucking both an anti-third term tradition and a 2-1 Democratic registration edge in this campaign, but neither fact may mean much. Nevada politics is dominated by its chief economic interests -- gambling, ranching and mining -- and the custodians of these interests customarily ignore both party lines and traditions in making their political choices. No reliable reports on this year's choices have yet seeped out, so the race must be considered a toss-up.

Senator -- Doubtful. Sen. George W. Malone (R), 68, vs. Howard W. Cannon (D), 46, Las Vegas city attorney.

Malone was elected by 5,248 votes in 1946, reelected by 2,772 votes in 1952, when President Eisenhower carried the state by 18,814. He was renominated this year without opposition. Malone has opposed most of the President's foreign policy and much of his domestic policy and is known as one of the most conservative Republicans in the Senate.

Cannon, who lost a 1956 bid for Democratic nomination to the House, was a late entrant in this year's Senate primary. With labor backing, he defeated favored Dr. Fred Anderson (D) of Reno, 22,520 to 21,341.

Nevada has been enjoying boom times in everything except the mining industry, and the President's recent action in putting import quotas on lead and zinc should help ease any anti-Republican sentiment in that quarter. Malone's personal fight against reciprocal trade legislation also puts him on the right side of that issue, as far as the state is concerned.

Malone has been a conspicuous beneficiary of Nevada's unique style of "bipartisan" politics in the past. In 1952, for instance, when Alan Bible (now the other Nevada Senator) lost the Democratic Senatorial nomination to Tom Mechling, large elements of the late Democratic Sen. Pat McCarran's organization switched into the Malone camp.

Malone may well receive the same kind of bipartisan support this year -- but, again, the conclusive evidence of this arrangement is not yet available.

Perhaps the greatest factor in Cannon's favor is the fact that he is from Las Vegas. The entire Congressional delegation now comes from Reno, and Las Vegas, which now surpasses Reno in population, resents being shut out. This was a major factor in Cannon's primary victory.

Cannon is not rated as Malone's equal in personal campaigning, nor does he have Malone's broad acquaintance around the state.

Representative-at-large -- Leans Democratic. Rep. Walter Baring (D) vs. Robert C. Horton (R), both of Reno.

Baring has run for this seat in the last five elections, winning it three times (1948, 1950 and 1956) and losing it twice (1952, 1954). In 1956, he had his biggest margin of victory, when he beat Horton's twin brother, Richard, by 7,946 votes. Baring led the Democratic ticket in 1956 and he is expected to do so again this year.

New Mexico

Governor -- Leans Republican. Gov. Edwin L. Mechem (R), 46, vs. State Rep. John Burroughs (D) of Portales.

Mechem is seeking an unprecedented fourth term as Governor. He was first elected in 1950, reelected two years later. In 1954 he ran for the Senate against Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D) and lost by 28,280 votes. He returned to the gubernatorial wars in 1956 and defeated incumbent Gov. John F. Simms (D) by 11,225 votes. He was unopposed for renomination this year.

Burroughs, who hails from the thinly populated East Side of the state, is a peanut processor and is classified as a conservative Democrat by New Mexico standards. He topped his closest competitor in the five-man primary field by 13,000 votes but received less than a majority of the total vote.

New Mexico observers think they see a strong Democratic trend this year, and the state is normally Democratic anyway. This could give Burroughs a shot at Mechem.

But the incumbent has several factors going for him. He is far and away the best Republican vote-getter in the state. The Democrats came out of their gubernatorial primary badly divided, and organized labor which opposed Burroughs in the primary, has taken a hands-off attitude in the general election. Many individual labor leaders are actively backing Mechem. Also, in the past, there has been a form of semi-public cooperation between Mechem and Sen. Dennis Chavez (D), who happens to be seeking reelection this year.

Senator -- Safe Democratic. Sen. Dennis Chavez (D), 70, vs. Forrest S. Atchley (R), Dora rancher.

Chavez was appointed to the Senate in 1935, elected to the remainder of the term in 1936 and reelected in 1940, 1946 and 1952. In the last two races, he won narrow victories over Patrick J. Hurley (R). His 1952 victory over Hurley by 5,375 votes was the subject of a long Senate investigation, which ended with Chavez occupying his accustomed seat.

Atchley's previous venture into statewide politics came in 1956, when he was defeated for one of the two at-large House seats by slightly less than 16,000 votes. He won a close victory over State Sen. Reginaldo Espinoza (R) in this year's senatorial primary.

Chavez has reportedly repaired all his political fences in preparation for this year's campaign. His position as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee and his standing with the state's substantial Mexican-American population appear to make him almost unbeatable.

House -- Both at-large seats appear Safe Democratic. Rep. Joseph M. Montoya (D), victor in a 1957 special election to replace the late Rep. Antonio M. Fernandez (D), is seeking reelection. State Rep. Thomas G. Morris (D) of Tucumcari is the other Democratic candidate. He was chosen to replace the late Rep. John J. Dempsey (D), who died shortly after the nominations closed this year.

The Republican candidates are George W. McKim and William A. Thompson, both of Albuquerque.

Oregon

Governor -- Doubtful. Gov. Robert D. Holmes (D), 48, vs. Secretary of State Mark Hatfield (R), 36.

Holmes, a former state senator, was elected in 1956 to complete the last two years of the term of the late Gov. Paul Patterson (R). He defeated Acting Gov. Elmo E. Smith (R) by a narrow 7,599 votes, while President Eisenhower was carrying the state by 77,189 votes and Sen. Wayne Morse (D) was gaining reelection by 61,444. Holmes has had a rough term as Governor, quarreling with the state legislature over taxes and with other Democrats over patronage and party policy. He drew two opponents in the May primary but won by better than a 2-1 margin over their combined vote.

Hatfield, a former teacher of political science and dean of students at Willamette University, served in the

state house of representatives from 1950 to 1954 and in the state senate from 1954 to 1956. He was elected secretary of state in 1956 despite a Democratic sweep of other state offices. Hatfield was a late entrant in the Republican gubernatorial primary this year, but he won a decisive victory over two major opponents, equalling their total vote.

The peculiar situation of the two parties in Oregon puts this race in the doubtful category. Oregon was a solidly Republican state until 1954, when a Democratic uprising elected Richard L. Neuberger to the Senate and Edith Green to the House. In 1956, the party captured the other Senate seat with Morse and took two of the three remaining House seats. From a heavy deficit in registrations, they have built up to a statewide registration lead of 42,684 voters.

But the Democrats have found it difficult to live with success. The quarrel between Morse and Neuberger, that made news all year in Washington, has been echoed on the state level by numerous feuds between local and state party officials. Holmes has found himself in the middle of many of these disputes.

Republicans, meanwhile, have discarded a losing issue of the past and found themselves a new leader. The party last July officially renounced its down-the-line opposition to public power development. Instead, it came out for establishment of a regional Federal power corporation -- a scheme almost identical to one Neuberger had proposed in the Senate.

This stand aggravated some conservative Republicans but it effectively deprived Democrats of what had been their chief talking point against the GOP.

Hatfield, himself, is a liberal Republican, an early Eisenhower booster. He is rated by both sides as a better campaigner than Holmes. However, the GOP has not yet fully recovered from its losses of the last four years and cannot match the precinct organization that the Democrats and their partners in organized labor can throw into the campaign. That fact, more than any other, may save Holmes his seat.

Senator -- No election.

House -- Democrats hold three seats, Republicans one. One Democratic seat (3rd) is safe; the other three districts can be called doubtful, but in each the incumbent is given a slight edge.

1st District (Salem, Northwest) -- Seven-term Rep. Walter Norblad (R) vs. state attorney general Robert Y. Thornton (D). Norblad, whose victory margin dropped from 65,924 votes in 1952 to 18,793 in 1956, was thought to be in serious trouble this year. He drew a strong opponent in the primary and some Republican newspapers editorialized that Norblad's defeat was necessary if the GOP was to save the seat in November. But Norblad won a decisive 2-1 victory in the primary, and is now given the edge for reelection. Thornton is rated a top Democratic contender, but this is the only district in Oregon with a predominantly Republican registration.

2nd District (Eastern) -- Freshman Rep. Al Ullman (D) vs. Marion T. Weatherford (R). Ullman beat the GOP incumbent by only 1,375 votes in 1956, mainly on the Hells Canyon dam issue. That issue has largely been blunted by the failure of the Democratic Congress to pass the Hells Canyon bill and by the switch in state GOP

policy on power. But Ullman is better known than his new opponent and the district now has a slight Democratic registration edge.

4th District (Southwest) -- Freshman Rep. Charles O. Porter (D) vs. ex-State Sen. Paul Geddes (R). Porter defeated the GOP incumbent by 4,495 votes in 1956. He has stayed in the news since his election by his dispute with Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic over the fate of Oregonian Gerald Murphy, alleged to have been killed by Trujillo's agents. Geddes is rated as a respected but not too-widely-known opponent, and he is up against a Democratic registration edge.

Utah

Governor -- No election.

Senator -- Leans Republican. Sen. Arthur V. Watkins (R), 71, vs. Frank E. (Ted) Moss (D), Salt Lake County attorney, and ex-Gov. J. Bracken Lee (Ind.), 59.

Watkins was elected to the Senate in 1946 by 4,885 votes and was reelected in 1952 by 27,837 votes. He has been one of the most consistent backers of President Eisenhower's policies. He was renominated by a 2-1 margin over Carvel Mattson in the September primary.

Moss is making his first statewide race after defeating Brigham Roberts by a 3-2 margin in the Democratic primary. He is considered a liberal Democrat.

Lee was elected Governor in 1948 and reelected in 1952. His second term was marked by controversy over his public condemnation of the Eisenhower Administration and his refusal to pay his Federal income taxes. Lee sought a third term in 1956 but lost by 8,000 votes in the GOP primary to George D. Clyde, who had the backing of Watkins. Lee ran as an Independent in the general election. He received 94,428 votes, compared to 127,164 for Clyde and 111,297 for L.C. Romney, (D). For the past two years, he has been the leader of For America, a group that advocates abolition of the personal income tax and foreign aid and U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. Lee did not file in the GOP Senatorial primary this year.

Utah observers sum up the complicated situation this way:

Democrats showed surprising strength in the primary election, outpolling the GOP for the first time in recent years. But nothing that has happened since then has indicated any such ground swell either for the party or for Moss personally.

Lee is a proved vote-getter, with a sizable personal following. He has conducted a clever campaign, aimed at drawing votes from Democrats who find Moss's views too liberal for them and from Republicans who disagree with Watkins' down-the-line support of Administration policies. His campaign theme is: "If you want a party to do right, you've got to vote against it when it is wrong." Although his own background is Republican, Lee is expected to take almost as much strength from Moss as from Watkins with this appeal.

Watkins has come in for some criticism in this campaign for seeking reelection at 71. He has answered it by pointing to the advantage the state accrues from his seniority. He also has reminded voters of the part he

played in securing passage of the Upper Colorado project, of vital interest to Utah.

The surprising anti-Watkins vote in the GOP primary was a clear indication that he made some enemies by his intervention against Lee in the 1956 gubernatorial race.

Despite the big Democratic primary vote, the Administration in general and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson in particular are believed to be widely popular in Utah, Benson's home state. Benson, Watkins and Moss are all Mormons; Lee is not, but that did not seem to hamper him in past campaigns in the predominantly Mormon state.

Nonetheless, the triple identification of Watkins with Benson, the Administration and the church are liable to contribute to his election as much as anything else.

Early polls put Lee in the lead, but the latest survey by the Salt Lake Tribune gave Watkins 35 percent of the state vote, Lee 29 percent and Moss 27 percent, with 9 percent undecided. Both Lee and Moss are given an outside chance of staging an upset, but Watkins rates the edge.

House -- Republicans hold both seats. The 1st District is regarded as safe and in the 2nd the incumbent is favored.

1st District (Outstate) -- Two-term Rep. Henry A. Dixon (R) vs. M. Blaine Peterson (D). Dixon won by 26,574 votes in 1956.

2nd District (Salt Lake City, Provo) -- Three term Rep. William A. Dawson (R) vs. David S. King (D), son of former Sen. William H. King (D 1917-41). Dawson won by 31,713 votes in 1956, but King is rated a strong candidate.

Washington

Governor -- No election.

Senator -- Safe Democratic. Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D), 46, vs. William B. Bantz (R) of Spokane.

Jackson went to the Senate in 1952 after six terms in the House by defeating incumbent Sen. Harry P. Cain (R) by 134,404 votes. He had only token opposition for renomination.

Bantz resigned as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington this year to accept the GOP Senatorial bid, his first political race. He was unopposed for the nomination.

Jackson outpolled Bantz by almost a 3-1 ratio in the September primary, and that is about the margin he is expected to have in the general election.

Among his other assets, Jackson can count on the support of the state labor unions, which have organized a major campaign to defeat a right-to-work referendum. A similar referendum was beaten decisively in 1956.

Jackson's candidacy and the presence of the right-to-work referendum are expected to aid the Democratic congressional slate.

House -- Democrats hold one seat; Republicans, six. The state was redistricted last year by a Democratic legislature. Democrats are expected to gain at least one seat (4th) and four other Republican districts are in jeopardy. (2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th).

1st District (Seattle) -- Redistricted to be made safe for Rep. Thomas M. Pelly (R).

2nd District (Northwest) -- Three-term Rep. Jack Westland (R) vs. ex-Rep. (1949-53) and ex-Sen. (1945-46) Hugh B. Mitchell (D). Redistricted to cut Republican

Governor, Eisenhower Percentages

This chart shows the recent voting for Governor in the eight Western states that will elect Governors in November. The first three columns give the WINNING CANDIDATE'S share of the total vote in 1956, 1954 and 1952. A "†" indicates a winner from a party opposing the current incumbent's. Columns 4 and 5 give the percentage of the vote won by President Eisenhower in 1956 and 1952.

Headnotes

† Opposite party.

‡ Not seeking reelection.

	1 % 1956	2 % 1954	3 % 1952	4 Eisenhower % 1956	5 Eisenhower % 1954
ARIZONA					
†McFarland D	59.5	52.5	60.2†	61.0	58.3
CALIFORNIA					
† Knight R	--	56.8	--	55.4	56.4
COLORADO					
McNichols D	51.3	53.6	57.1†	59.5	60.3
IDAHO					
Smylie R	--	54.2	--	61.2	65.4
NEVADA					
Russell R	--	53.1	--	58.0	61.4
NEW MEXICO					
Mechem R	52.1	57.0†	53.8	57.8	55.4
OREGON					
Holmes D	50.5	56.9†	--	55.3	60.5
WYOMING					
Simpson R	--	50.5	--	60.1	62.7

strength. Westland won by 22,780 votes in 1956, but Democrats led in the primary vote by a 3-2 ratio. Mitchell is a newcomer to the district, having represented Seattle during most of his political career, and Westland may be able to exploit this fact to save his seat against the redistricting odds.

3rd District (Southwest) -- Six-term Rep. Russell V. Mack vs. Secretary of State Victor A. Meyers. Unaffected by redistricting. Mack won by 18,558 votes in 1956 and Republicans slightly outpolled Democrats in the primary. Meyers for years has combined careers as a band leader and politician.

4th District (Southeast) -- Frank LeRoux (D) vs. State Rep. Catherine May (R). Unaffected by redistricting. LeRoux lost to Rep. Hal Holmes (R) by only 1,250 votes in 1956, and Holmes is retiring. Democrats outpolled Republicans by a 2-1 margin in the primary. This is the Democrats' likeliest pickup.

5th District (Spokane, Northeast) -- Eight-term Rep. Walt Horan (R) vs. Tom Delaney (D). Unaffected by redistricting. Delaney lost to Horan by 11,659 votes in

Election Roundup - 9

1956, but Democrats outpolled the GOP slightly in the primary.

6th District (Tacoma, West Central) -- Six-term Rep. Thor C. Tollefson (R) vs. ex-Rep. John M. Coffee (D). Redistricted to cut the Republican vote. Tollefson beat Coffee in 1946 and 1950, had a 16,136-vote margin in 1956. But after redistricting, Democrats polled a slightly larger primary vote than the GOP.

7th District (South Seattle, Bremerton) -- Three-term Rep. Don Magnuson (D) vs. Seattle Councilman Bob Jones (R). Created in the redistricting as a new home for Magnuson, who has been elected at-large. Democrats outpolled Republicans by a 2-1 margin in the primary. Pelly has been working hard for Jones in what was formerly his bailiwick, but it looks like safe territory for Magnuson this year at least.

Wyoming

Governor -- Leans Republican. Gov. Milward L. Simpson (R), 60, vs. J.J. Hickey (D), 46, Cheyenne attorney.

Simpson is seeking a second term after a narrow 1,112-vote victory in 1956. He has been a popular Governor and had only minor opposition in the primary for renomination.

Hickey is a former Carbon County Attorney, former U.S. Attorney and former state Democratic chairman. He was nominated without opposition this year for his first state-wide race.

Party forces are almost evenly balanced in Wyoming, and the close contest is the rule, not the exception here. The state was less affected than most by the recession and Republicans claim there are no signs of the national Democratic trend.

Simpson is regarded as the strongest candidate on the GOP ticket and his chances are bolstered by the presence of a third party candidate, Louis W. Carlson, who is campaigning for legalized gambling in the state. He may draw votes that otherwise would have gone to Hickey.

Senator -- Leans Republican. Sen. Frank A. Barrett (R), 64, vs. Gale McGee (D), 43 of Laramie.

Barrett, a former Representative and Governor, was elected to the Senate in 1952 by a 4,255-vote margin over Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney (D). He is most often found in the conservative Republican camp.

McGee is a professor of history at the University of Wyoming. He worked as O'Mahoney's legislative assistant for a year, and his views put him on the liberal side of the Democratic spectrum. A popular and effective speaker, he defeated Hepburn T. Armstrong by a 3-2 margin in the August primary to gain the Senatorial finals. This is his first political race.

McGee has been making a strong campaign and is given a chance to upset Barrett. But the edge is given the incumbent, mainly on the basis of his personal friendships throughout the state and his record as a "service Senator" for his constituents.

House -- Doubtful. Two-term Rep. E. Keith Thomson (R) vs. Ray Whitaker (D). Thomson won by 19,678 votes in 1956 -- a huge plurality by Wyoming standards. But Whitaker has twice been elected as county attorney in Natrona County (Casper), second-largest in the state and normally a Republican stronghold. Thomson will have to cut into the normal Democratic strength in Laramie County (Cheyenne), his home town, to beat off Whitaker's challenge.

Voting in Key Western Districts

This chart shows the recent voting history of 25 Congressional districts in the West that may bear watching in this election. Columns 1, 2 and 3 give the WINNING CANDIDATE's share of the vote in 1956, 1954 and 1952. A "†" indicates that the winner was not of the same party as the current incumbent; that is, a switched district. Columns 4 and 5 give the percentage of the vote won by Mr. Eisenhower in 1956 and 1952.

Headnotes

*Doubtful district won by less than 55 percent of total vote.

†Switched district.

‡Not seeking reelection.

	1 % 1956	2 % 1954	3 % 1952	4 Eisenhower 1956	5 % 1952
ARIZONA					
* 1 Rhodes R	54.9	53.1	54.0	63.0	60.6
CALIFORNIA					
*11 McFall D	53.1	52.6†	X†	52.3	55.5
*29 Saund D	51.5	57.9†	X†	61.4	64.7
* 7 Allen R	52.8	53.0	X	54.4	52.7
* 6 Baldwin R	53.7	50.9	50.6†	49.0	47.3
* 1 Scudder R ‡	53.6	59.1	X	60.1	63.9
30 Wilson R	66.8	60.4	59.6	63.7	62.0
Los Angeles County					
21 Hiestand R	62.6	58.7	53.6	61.0	63.3
25 Hillings R ‡	63.8	65.2	64.3	63.6	65.8
15 McDonough R	57.9	56.9	X	54.7	57.2
COLORADO					
* 3 Chenoweth R	50.2	53.0	57.7	57.8	59.0
* 2 Hill R ‡	53.4	55.3	63.1	63.8	65.6
IDAHO					
2 Budge R	60.0	60.8	66.2	64.3	68.6
MONTANA					
* 2 Anderson D	50.9	50.6†	62.0†	56.5	61.0
NEVADA					
AL Baring D	54.2	54.5†	50.5†	58.0	61.4
OREGON					
* 4 Porter D	51.3	55.9†	66.3†	55.0	63.9
* 2 Ullman D	50.7	52.6†	58.5†	54.3	62.1
* 1 Norblad R	54.7	63.0	68.0	58.9	63.9
UTAH					
2 Dawson R	57.6	57.2	52.5	64.6	58.2
WASHINGTON					
* 4 Holmes R ‡	50.4	61.0	67.5	57.8	61.4
* 5 Horan R	53.8	58.6	56.0	54.7	56.2
3 Mack R	56.5	64.9	53.3	52.0	53.4
* 6 Tollefson R	54.0	55.2	59.8	52.3	50.3
2 Westland R	56.0	52.4	54.2	54.7	54.5
WYOMING					
AL Thomson R	58.2	56.2	60.1	60.1	62.7

THE TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S LOS ANGELES CAMPAIGN SPEECH

Following is the complete prepared text of President Eisenhower's Oct. 20 campaign speech at the Shrine Auditorium, Los Angeles, Calif. (see p. 1363):

Fellow Americans --
Fellow Republicans --

Here in California two years ago, I renewed a personal pledge to America -- to keep your Government on a steady, even course, guided only by the public good.

I promised you several things:

Fiscal integrity;

A sound, free economy;

Honesty, efficiency and thrift in Government;

A national defense -- modern and strong; and, above all, always to strive for a just and lasting peace. Overwhelmingly, you of California approved those pledges.

And this I believe:

I believe you still want sane, forward-looking, honest Government in America.

That's why I'm back -- to call upon everyone listening tonight to help carry forward those pledges, and that kind of Government, by preaching -- working -- voting Republican in this campaign. To hold back now is to abandon what you and I believe in and want for America.

For make no mistake about it -- good Government vitally concerns your business, your farm, your job, your home. It directly affects the prices you pay at the corner store.

Good Government is your own responsibility -- not someone else's.

Work not done, votes not cast, letters not sent, phone calls not made, are sins of omission against the kind of Government that you and I, and independents and discerning Democrats want.

Let's have no more family bickering -- fancied or real. It just helps defeat what we want.

I have been told that there has been apathy in our campaign. Not any more. Too many citizens know how much depends upon which party runs a state and the national Congress.

Here let's consider a significant fact.

The Democrat party is not one -- but two -- political parties with the same name. They unite only once every two years -- to wage political campaigns.

At one extreme is a wing whose campaigns were largely settled in Southern primaries held weeks ago. At the other extreme is the stronger wing, dominated by political radicals. The campaigns of this wing are still going on.

These self-styled liberals are the ones who really challenge sane, sound, forward-looking Government in the United States. It is against the spread of their radical influence that we are waging this campaign.

In that fight we must be together 100 percent.

"POLES APART"

Our Republican party and these political radicals are poles apart. A few examples will prove the importance of these disagreements.

First -- all of us know that parts of organized labor have long been terribly abused by hoodlums and racketeers.

The proof of this has been amply demonstrated by the McClellan Committee of the Senate.

These evil elements are deeply entrenched. Only powerful, new legal weapons can root them out and protect the rank and file.

Last session I urged Congress to give American workers the weapons to drive racketeers and corrupt leaders out of the labor movement. Republicans in Congress went all out for such a law.

But the radical opposition killed it -- offering in its place a substitute far too weak to do the job. Rightly, Republicans rejected that political bait. (Weekly Report p. 1258)

My friends, to protect American workers and businessmen, to conserve strong, clean trade unions -- the Nation needs a

Congress determined to settle this issue. That means America needs a Republican Congress.

Another example:

Most Americans are against reckless public spending. As to this, the record of Congressional radicals is too clear and recent to need explanation. One single Senator introduced bills this year that, if passed, would have spent tens of billions of dollars unnecessarily.

CRITICAL CHOICE

Most of us believe deeply in the constitutional rights of the states. But in every session of Congress the radicals persistently try to vest more and more authority in the Federal Government. They are the ones who turn to Federal power even where private power can do the job -- to governmental housing where private housing can meet the need -- to Federal domination of agriculture rather than trusting to the initiative and freedom of the farmer -- to Federal development of nuclear power where private development will best serve the interests of the United States.

As a result, the opposition record is one of ever higher taxes -- of dollars worth 50 cents -- of sky-high prices -- of an economy harassed into producing fewer jobs, chronic unemployment, labor strife, and fear of the future.

I repeat -- if you don't want that kind of Government, work for a Republican victory.

My friends -- over the years we Republicans have had our family spats. But look at our opponents. They have political schizophrenia. They are hopelessly split -- right down the middle. In Congress they crash headlong into each other on every important domestic issue.

One wing attacks states' rights -- the other defends them.

One prates of civil rights -- the other fights them.

One stands for big Government -- the other for decentralization.

One wing is big city -- the other rural.

One is spendthrift -- the other conservative.

In short, our opposition can offer America only deadlocked Government -- Government that wages war on itself.

Long ago I found out that, to a political radical, a sound program for America is an invitation for demagogic excess.

This year in Congress that happened time and again. One after another, Administration bills were mangled or mushroomed by extremists pursuing economic and political goals at odds with American tradition. We saw this in housing and public works, in agriculture and unemployment benefits -- in urban redevelopment and Federal-state-community relations. It happened in every area where these self-styled liberals might have a field day.

We saw it constantly in efforts to spend, unnecessarily, billions more of Federal dollars. Only sturdy Republican resistance in Congress and my vetoes blocked over \$5 billion of this spending. I remind you -- these Federal billions are your own money. Either they come out of your pay check through higher taxes, or your pocket is picked by inflation. (Weekly Report p. 1231)

This campaign, then, gives us a critical choice. Either we chose left-wing Government or sensible, forward-looking Government -- spendthrift Government or responsible Government -- over-powering Federal Government or Government kept close to home -- frustrated, stymied Government or efficient Government able to keep its promise to America.

If you are for trustworthy, progressive Government -- then it is clear you should talk Republican, work Republican -- and, on Nov. 4, vote Republican.

Our accomplishments these past six years fully justify your doing so.

First, take our pledge to strive for a just peace. This effort Americans have instinctively wanted to keep nonpartisan, and I shall continue doing my best to keep it so. I am glad -- even

proud -- to say that responsible leaders of both parties have fully supported the purpose of preserving a just peace.

As to this effort, what does the record show?

It shows that during six years of serious international stress, America has remained at peace. God willing, we are going to stay at peace.

Today -- from Lebanon to Quemoy -- those in the world who would do us harm know that America will not be bullied. They know that America will not countenance territorial expansion by force. They know that America will not desert her friends.

America is allergic to appeasement. There will be no appeasing Communist aggression while I am President.

The record shows that for six years no new victim has fallen to Communist imperialism. Our young men have not gone to war.

Tirelessness in the search for peace -- a search anchored firmly in principle -- this we promised. In this, we have kept faith with America.

We promised strength in national defense.

No matter what the political merchants of fear and defeat would have you believe, we have kept that promise.

The striking power of our Strategic Air Command is beyond imagination. There is no comparable military instrument on the face of the earth.

SAC is ready for any emergency. It is a mighty deterrent to war -- a servant in the cause of peace.

On hundreds of airfields, thousands of our tactical aircraft are dispersed. Our distant warning systems feature the best equipment industry has been able to produce.

On Navy carriers are hundreds of medium-range and tactical aircraft. As always, the United States Marines are ready. The unmatched competence of our atomic submarines is known to all. Our Army is modernized, mobile, prepared to repel aggression.

Under a new law -- incidentally, one for which I fought for 12 long years -- the Defense Department has now been reorganized to suit modern conditions. The rewards will be more efficiency -- more strength. (Weekly Report p. 957)

Next, ballistic missiles. Fast-talking critics of this huge program have apparently failed to check the record.

Here is the incontestable fact.

For eight long years after World War II, there was inadequate emphasis on the development of long-range ballistic missiles. In fact, in no single year was more than a million dollars actually spent for this purpose until this Administration took office.

One of my earliest acts was to start an exhaustive scientific study of missiles. This made our need crystal-clear -- and all long-range ballistic missile research and development programs were given the Nation's highest priority as to talent and money.

As a result, today the so-called missile gap is being rapidly filled. The progress we have made on every type of missile and rocket should awaken the pride of every American citizen.

To our own great power, we must add the resources of allies who, with us, belong to an extensive system of collective security. That system greatly increases the power of every member.

Clearly, we have fulfilled our promise to keep America's defenses strong -- for the Nation's safety -- and for the cause of peace.

A healthy, free economy was another of our Republican promises.

Again, the record:

ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

During the past six years there has been more improvement in the level of living -- more investment in America's future -- a prosperity more widely-shared -- than in any comparable period in our history. And we have done this in the post Korean War period, a kind of period historically characterized by depression.

Of course, in a free society economic dips will occasionally occur. Just over a year ago our economy experienced such a downturn.

At that time of economic challenge, what did sound Republican Government do?

Without resorting to costly, dislocating Federal programs, we led the way to victory over this recession and are making it one of the shortest in history. Meanwhile, the extremists ran true to form. Massive public works, heavy-handed Federal spending -- these, they said, were America's salvation from complete collapse -- a collapse which they unceasingly forecast.

During that period they trafficked in defeatism and fear of the future. They argued distrust of America's economy. Their remedy was the usual one -- take over in Washington, D.C., and spoon-feed the economy with Federal dollars.

Common sense prevailed -- sane Government refused to stampede. Instead of using a mailed fist on the economy, your Government applied a helpful, reassuring hand. Today, with that help, and because of our faith in the American system, the economy is still sound.

Every economic indicator proves it. Last month, as hundreds of thousands went back to work, unemployment dropped 600,000. (Weekly Report p. 1339)

Factory workers' pay has never been as high. Personal income is the highest ever. Home building is booming. More housing units were started last month than in any September in the past eight years.

Steel output -- new construction -- employment -- everywhere there is growing economic strength.

Things are good, and getting better every day.

PROSPERITY UNMATCHED

All of us know, however, that some who are seeking jobs are still unemployed. I know my concern over their well-being is shared by all Americans.

But destruction of the economic machinery that provides jobs for 64 million other workers will not help anyone. Keeping that machinery efficient and hard at work is our best assurance of providing jobs.

Today America is generating a peacetime prosperity that will be unmatched.

We are living up to our economic pledge -- a pledge that will always be part of Republican purposes and platforms.

And now -- a word about agriculture -- always a key part of our economy. I am glad to say it is prospering, too.

Now, that pleases farmers, and it pleases me. But a lot of demagogues are sorely disappointed. Their hoped-for issue evaporated.

All over America farm prices are higher today than when rigid price supports were last fully in effect. Net farm income is up 20 percent over last year. Per capita farm income is the highest ever. So is gross farm income. (Weekly Report p. 1258)

Here in California farm receipts are running \$50 million over a year ago.

We promised farm people a self-reliant, free agriculture, and emphasis on research. We promised new markets -- and these past two years we exported over \$8.5 billion worth of farm products -- a record amount. We pledged sensible price supports. We promised help for the long-neglected, lowest income farm people. We promised to stop bureaucratic badgering of farmers. Those promises, too, we have kept.

My friends, it would be most enlightening if I could finish this discussion of Republican accomplishments in these past six years.

But just quickly --

- Stultifying controls removed from our economy;
- The Defense Department reorganized;
- Super highways crisscrossing America;
- Satellites, long-range ballistic missiles, a new outer space agency;
- A new agency for civil aviation;
- The St. Lawrence Seaway;
- Statehood for Alaska;
- The largest tax cut of all time;
- A new Cabinet Department for Health, Education and Welfare;
- Social Security insurance expanded;
- Unemployment insurance expanded;
- Small business encouraged;
- Federal positions cut by a quarter of a million;
- Bright prosperity ahead;
- An America mighty in arms -- courageously standing for principle -- an America spiritually and economically strong --
- An America at peace.

Fellow citizens -- whether Republicans, independents, or Democrats -- this record justifies support for Republican candidates from coast to coast.

Certainly that goes for California.

The stakes are such that we should eagerly devote our time, our effort, our money to this cause.

We need to support Bill Knowland -- Goodwin Knight -- Pat Hillings -- your whole Republican slate of state candidates. We need to reelect California's Republican congressmen and add some more.

For America, we need a Republican Congress.

If only all of us go full out, as our fine Vice President, Dick Nixon has -- we, together will achieve victory. (According to the Associated Press, the President in delivering his speech at this point departed from his prepared text and, instead of the sentence above dealing with Vice President Nixon, said, "One of our most effective leaders in this great fight is our distinguished Vice President and your fellow Californian, Dick Nixon. He is giving us a shining example of dedication to the cause of good Government.")

Those -- my friends -- are my very special requests to each of you. I make them for our party, for our country, and for those who in years to come deserve to enjoy the blessings we have had in free America.

Thank you; good night.

NEW FLAG DESIGN

The White House Oct. 16 issued the following statement concerning a new design for the flag, necessitated by Alaska statehood:

To assist him in determining the most desirable modification of the United States flag in connection with the forthcoming admission of the new State of Alaska, the President has asked the Secretaries of State, Defense and the Treasury and the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts to join informally in recommending to him a proposed new design for the flag.

In accordance with this request, a preliminary meeting was held this morning in the White House at which the past history of the changes in the flag was discussed, as were various alternative suggestions for the current modification, submitted by the public as well as appropriate executive agencies. Over 1,900 suggestions have been received from interested citizens.

It is anticipated that this informal group will submit a recommendation to the President within the next few weeks, following which he will issue an executive order designating the new design of the flag. This procedure is in accordance with existing law and past precedents. Public Law 279 -- 80th Congress provides that the new design shall take effect on the fourth day of July following the admission of a new state to the Union.

NIXON TELEGRAM

The White House Oct. 16 released a telegram on foreign policy in the election campaign, sent to Vice President Richard M. Nixon by President Eisenhower. Following is the complete text (Weekly Report p. 1338, 1365):

The Hon. Richard Nixon
The Vice President
Hotel Ambassador
Los Angeles, Calif.

I have now read Foster Dulles' interpretive statement of yesterday morning. I think this should clear the atmosphere, particularly in pointing out that there is no real difference between the two of you.

For my part I want to point out the following. Both political parties have taken a common stand for a number of years on the essential foundations of a foreign policy. Both of us are dedicated to peace, to the renunciation of force except for defense, to the principles of the United Nations Charter, to opposing Communist expansion, to promoting the defensive and economic strength of the free world through cooperative action, including mutual aid and technical assistance.

While in my view these, with rare exceptions, should not and do not lend themselves to political argument, the matter of administrative operation of foreign policy -- whether or not agreed goals are in fact realized -- has time and again been challenged both by ourselves in the past and very recently by some of our political opponents. As Foster pointed out, these need to be answered whenever they occur. Questions and criticism have

involved Lebanon, our relationship with Nationalist China, the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, etc. These actions, when criticized should be supported by our side. No one can do this more effectively than you.

At times it is of course difficult to distinguish between policy and administrative operations. However, the generalization I have made, is, I believe, a good one.

All the best to you.

D.E.

END OF CEASE-FIRE

After the President and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles conferred by telephone early Oct. 20 on the end of the Quemoy cease-fire, White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty released the following statement (see p. 1365):

Both the President and Chiang Kai-shek had been hopeful that the suspension of hostilities gave a good opportunity to advance the cause of peace in that area. They had also both agreed that it would be useful for the Secretary of State to continue his visit to Formosa on his peaceful mission. Despite the bombardment that the Chinese Communists opened this morning, the President and the Secretary of State hope the bombardment will be of short duration and that peace will be restored to the area.

Capitol Briefs

SUPREME COURT ACTIONS

The Supreme Court Oct. 20 took the following major actions: Ordered the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to reconsider its approval of Federal Communications Commission reassignment of television Channel 2 from Springfield, Ill., to St. Louis, and television channel 8 from Peoria, Ill., to the Davenport-Rock Island-Moline area of Iowa and Illinois. The Court said the lower court should consider testimony given before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Legislative Oversight Subcommittee that the FCC had been influenced improperly to make the reassignment. (Weekly Report p. 706)

Tentatively agreed to review the cases of Talmadge Raley, Joseph Stern and Emmett Calvin Brown, who were convicted of contempt in Ohio for refusing to answer questions put by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. The three argued that the statute creating the commission was vague and the pertinency of the questions asked them not clear. (For discussion of contempt cases, Weekly Report p. 1070)

Refused to review claims that manufacturers were entitled to excise tax rebates for money spent making good on warrantied products.

Agreed to rule on a Baltimore city ordinance requiring householders to admit health inspectors without search warrants if the inspectors believe unsanitary conditions exist.

Agreed to decide whether a so-called "employee committee" originally created by management but engaged in negotiation was a labor organization under Federal labor law.

DEFENSE BUDGET

Deputy Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles Oct. 18 said an increase in defense spending of between 5 percent and 10 percent was indicated for fiscal 1960 as compared with fiscal 1959. The Bureau of the Budget Sept. 11 estimated fiscal 1959 defense spending at \$40.8 billion. (Weekly Report p. 1202)

SPACE AGENCY

Rep. Olin E. Teague (D Texas) Oct. 23 said Congress never intended to "strip the Army of its missile program" when it created the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Teague said "breaking up of the Army scientific team...would be a serious setback in the national defense." He was referring to reports that NASA asked the Army to transfer 2,000 top missile men to NASA jurisdiction. (Weekly Report p. 1339)

(For Around the Capitol see p. 1365)

NAACP RATES CONGRESS

The National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People is sending its 300,000 members the voting records of Senators and Representatives seeking reelection. Following are the votes the NAACP selected. The page numbers refer to the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report voting charts that show how each Member voted on the selected roll-call. "Y" or "N" following the reference indicates whether the NAACP wanted a "yea" or "nay" vote. The NAACP's stand was announced at the time of each vote and indicated in the vote descriptions.

HOUSE VOTES

JURY TRIAL AMENDMENT -- Richard H. Poff (R Va.) amendment to Civil Rights Act of 1957 (HR 6127) to recommit the bill in order to provide for jury trials in any criminal contempt action arising under the legislation. Rejected 158-251 (D 113-112; R 45-139), June 18, 1957. (1957 Almanac p. 348) N.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT -- Passage of Senate version of HR 6127 containing compromise jury trial provision. Adopted 279-97 (D 128-82; R 151-15), Aug. 27, 1957. (1957 Almanac p. 378) Y.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION -- Louis C. Rabaut (D Mich.) amendment to Executive Offices' Appropriation Bill (HR 10589) to appropriate \$750,000 for the Civil Rights Commission. Agreed to 273-98 (D 116-82; R 157-16), April 1, 1958. (Weekly Report p. 446) Y.

ALASKA STATEHOOD -- Passage of the bill (HR 7999) to grant Alaska statehood. Passed 208-166 (D 117-81; R 91-85), May 28, 1958. (Weekly Report p. 698) Y.

SUPREME COURT CURB -- Passage of a bill (HR 3) to prevent the Supreme Court from nullifying state laws on the grounds of Federal-preemption. Passed 241-155 (D 100-109; R 141-46), July 17, 1958. (Weekly Report p. 952) N.

SENATE VOTES

RULE 22 -- Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) motion to table the motion of Clinton P. Anderson (D N.M.) to consider adoption of new Senate rules. Anderson's motion would have cleared the way for revising the filibuster rule. Tabling motion accepted 55-38 (D 27-21; R 28-17), Jan. 4, 1957. (Weekly Report p. 1319) N.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL -- Richard B. Russell (D Ga.) point of order against William F. Knowland's (R Calif.) objection to sending the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (HR 6127) to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Knowland's objection put HR 6127 directly on the calendar. Russell's point of order was rejected 39-45 (D 34-11; R 5-34), June 20, 1957. (1957 Almanac p. 302) N.

Anderson (D N.M.) - George D. Aiken (R Vt.) amendment to eliminate Section 121 of Part III of HR 6127, which would have permitted the Attorney General to institute civil suits to prevent the violation of civil rights. Accepted 52-38 (D 34-13; R 18-25), July 24, 1957. (1957 Almanac p. 306) N.

Joseph C. O'Mahoney (D Wyo.) - Estes Kefauver (D Tenn.) - Frank Church (D Idaho) amendment to guarantee

jury trials in all cases of criminal contempt. Accepted 51-42 (D 39-9; R 12-33), Aug. 2, 1957. (1957 Almanac p. 307) N.

Johnson (D Texas) motion that Senate concur in the House version of HR 6127. Agreed to 60-15 (D 23-15; R 37-0), Aug. 29, 1957. (1957 Almanac p. 314) Y.

SUPREME COURT -- Thomas C. Hennings Jr. (D Mo.) motion to table (thus kill) a bill (S 2646) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Agreed to 49-41 (D 30-16; R 19-25) Aug. 20. (Weekly Report p. 1124) Y.

Hennings motion to table an amendment adding HR 3 to a pending Senate bill. Rejected 39-46 (D 25-19; R 14-27), Aug. 20, 1958. (Weekly Report p. 1125) Y.

John A. Carroll (D Colo.) motion to recommit a bill (S 654) to reverse a Supreme Court decision on state subversive activities laws. Adopted 41-40 (D 27-17; R 14-23), Aug. 21, 1958. (Weekly Report p. 1125) Y.

ALASKA STATEHOOD -- Passage of a bill (HR 7999) to grant statehood for Alaska. Passed 64-20 (D 31-13; R 33-7), June 30, 1958. (Weekly Report p. 886) Y.

MINE WORKERS' ENDORSEMENTS

The United Mine Workers Oct. 15 announced its endorsement of 55 candidates in 20 coal mining states:

The endorsements, with asterisks denoting non-incumbents and numbers in parentheses districts:

ALABAMA -- House: Carl Elliott (D 7), George Huddleston Jr. (D 9). **COLORADO** -- House: Byron G. Rogers (D 1), Byron L. Johnson (D 2),* Fred M. Betz (D 3),* Wayne Aspinall (D 4). **ILLINOIS** -- House: Kenneth J. Gray (D 25). **INDIANA** -- Senate: Vance Hartke (D),* House: Fred Wampler (D 6),* William G. Bray (R 7), W.K. Denton (D 8). **IOWA** -- House: Merwin Coad (D 6). **KENTUCKY** -- House: William H. Natcher (D 2), Carl D. Perkins (D 7), Eugene Siler (R 8). **KANSAS** -- House: Myron V. Coorge (R 3). **MARYLAND** -- House: John R. Foley (D 6),* **MISSOURI** -- Senate: Stuart Symington (D), House: George H. Christopher (D 4), Morgan M. Moulder (D 11). **MONTANA** -- Senate: Mike Mansfield (D), House: LeRoy H. Anderson (D 2). **NEW MEXICO** -- Senate: Dennis Chavez (D), House: Joseph M. Montoya (D AL). **NORTH DAKOTA** -- Senate: William Langer (R), House: Quentin N. Burdick (D AL),* **OHIO** -- Senate: Stephen M. Young (D),* House: Wayne L. Hayes (D 18). **OKLAHOMA** -- House: Ed Edmondson (D 2), Carl Albert (D 3), Thomas Steed (D 4). **PENNSYLVANIA** -- Senate: George M. Leader (D),* House: Daniel J. Flood (D 11), Ivor D. Fenton (R 12), James E. Van Zandt (R 20), John H. Dent (D 21), John P. Saylor (R 22), Frank M. Clark (D 25), Thomas E. Morgan (D 26), Elmer J. Holland (D 30). **UTAH** -- Senate: Frank E. Moss (D),* House: M. Blaine Peterson (D 2),* **VIRGINIA** -- Senate: Dr. Louise O. Wensel (Ind.),* **WASHINGTON** -- Senate: Henry M. Jackson (D), House: Thor G. Tollefson (R 6), Don Magnuson (D 7). **WEST VIRGINIA** -- Senate: Robert C. Byrd (D),* House: Robert Mollohan (D 1),* Harley O. Staggers (D 2), Cleveland M. Bailey (D 3), John L. Slack Jr. (D 4),* Elizabeth Kee (D 5), Kenneth Hechler (D 6),* **WYOMING** -- Senate: Gale McGee (D),* House: Ray Whitaker (D AL),*

CAMPAIGN ORATORY NEARS CRESCENDO

Campaign talk filled the air last week, as the deadline for the 1958 elections approached. Here are the words of the top party spokesmen:

President Eisenhower

President Eisenhower, in major campaign speeches, touched on most of the issues of the campaign. He started a five-day swing Oct. 17 with a "non-political" talk to the national plowing contest outside Cedar Rapids, Iowa: "Our farmers should always be free to make their own decisions and to use free markets to reflect the wishes of producers and consumers. Due largely to these practices of freedom, farm prices are going up. Generally these prices are higher now than when rigid price supports were last in effect. Farmers still have some serious difficulties -- including the cost-price squeeze. But we are making real progress."

Stopped off in Abilene, Kan., and Denver on non-political business but was photographed with and endorsed Republican candidates for Governor and Congress.

Los Angeles, Oct. 20 -- Told a rally and a regional television audience the Democratic party is "hopelessly split -- right down the middle" but is dominated by "political radicals" from the Northern states. "These self-styled liberals are the ones who really challenge sane, sound forward-looking Government in the United States. It is against the spread of their radical influence that we are waging this campaign." (For full text, see Weekly Report p. 1359)

San Francisco, Oct. 21 -- Told a rally, "The corruption in some labor unions and in their relationships with management threatens a serious weakening of those industrial relations which have become basic to our national welfare. Where leadership has been faithless in the fiscal management of union affairs, these conditions must be fumigated. This corruption must be stopped. I am extremely disappointed at the refusal of the Democratic Congress to pass this vital legislation (to curb union corruption)." (Weekly Report p. 1258)

Learned that his efforts to heal the breach between California Gov. Goodwin J. Knight (R) and Sen. William F. Knowland (R Calif.) apparently had failed. "Nothing has changed," Knight said, implying he still would not endorse Knowland for Governor.

Chicago, Oct. 22 -- In a speech before a national television audience, accused "the radicals in Congress" of "frantically merchandising doubt and fear" about the Nation's economy and quoted the chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers as predicting "further increases in jobs and in incomes" along with a "stable consumer price level over the next year."

"America today is more powerfully armed than ever before.... Last July, prompt action in Lebanon gave aggressors full warning that America would not tolerate an assault on the free world. Again, in the Formosa Straits America has shown that it will not countenance territorial expansion by Communist force." (See p. 1365)

Vice President Nixon

Vice President Richard M. Nixon last week continued to stress foreign policy as the chief issue in the campaign after winning President Eisenhower's and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles's approval of this strategy.

Pikesville, Md., Oct. 21 -- "We are proud of the fact that many Democrats... have supported the Eisenhower foreign policy.... I do not question the right or the responsibility of the radical wing of the Democratic party to question our policies.... I do not question the sincerity or patriotism of those who criticize our policies....

"There is no war party in the United States.... There is no party of surrender in the United States.... There is only one party of treason in the United States -- the Communist party....

"We believe that the record of this Administration -- which got the United States out of one war, has kept it out of others, and has maintained peace without surrender of principle or territory over the past six years -- proves the wisdom of our policy of firmness and strength. On the contrary, we believe that the policy of weakness and vacillation of the previous administration which was developed under Mr. Acheson... has been tried and found wanting. We have learned once and for all that in dealing with dictators... a weak policy is a war policy, a firm policy is a peace policy."

The Democratic Digest, an official party publication, Oct. 18 said, "There is only one Nixon -- the real Nixon, the white collar McCarthy as he has sometimes been called, who will resort to any vilification to win votes."

Sen. Lyndon Johnson

Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) rejected foreign policy as a key campaign issue:

Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 20 -- "The basic issue of this campaign can be simply stated. It is whether the American people will strengthen a Democratic Congress which has acted boldly but prudently to meet the problems of our times or whether the Congress will be entrusted to a party which refuses to accept the 20th Century....

"This campaign is not -- or should not be -- a preview of the 1960 Presidential election. The American people have a President and he has been selected to serve two more years....

"There are some who try to tell us that the issue is support of the President's foreign policies. I wish that Republicans would have as tender feelings toward the President's foreign policy during a session of Congress as they do during a political campaign....

"Never in our history has a President received such responsible backing from an opposition party.... And I can pledge you this: Never shall the Democratic party participate in dividing the country in the face of a foreign aggressor. And never shall the Democratic party take part in tearing down the constitutional institutions of our Government." (For Formosa debate, see p. 1365)

DEMOCRATS QUARREL

The North-South feud in the Democratic party continued to simmer last week.

Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler touched off the new round of arguments with his comments on an Oct. 19 television program. He predicted the 1960 convention would adopt a "no compromise" civil rights plank and said those in the party who "don't want to go along on the racial problem and the whole area of human rights...are going to have to take political asylum wherever they can find it, either in the Republican party or a third party.... I certainly would hope they would take leave of the Democratic party."

Butler added that "Southern domination" of Congressional committee chairmanships "is a very serious matter for the Democratic party and the country." He said it would be "unfortunate" if the South "were led to remain in the Democratic column in 1960 just to pocket the chairmanships."

Sen. George Smathers (D Fla.), chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, Oct. 21 wrote Butler that his statements "do not...in anyway enhance our chances in the elections of 1958, but to the contrary point up our differences and indicate to the country a division within our party.... I humbly suggest to you that you cease firing on the issues of 1960 -- and let's concentrate on winning the elections of 1958, which can be won or lost within the next two weeks."

Leaders in various Southern states warned that Butler's statement had damaged party unity, but unanimously opposed the formation of a third party in the South.

Gov.-elect Ernest Vandiver (D) of Georgia Oct. 20 said "Butler, et al" should not attempt to read Southerners out of the party but should, themselves, join one "standing for beliefs more nearly in line with their own extremely leftist beliefs. Southerners intend to remain in the house of their fathers until and unless those like Mr. Butler become so obnoxious that true Democrats are forced to band together in a new Democratic party."

The day before Butler's TV statement, former President Harry S. Truman had predicted the Democrats would carry all the Southern states that "count."

"We may not keep them all, but we don't need them all," he said. "The best reason they have to stay with the party is that they hate to give up their seniority."

Mr. Truman added, however, that "it might be good for the country" if some Southerners lost their committee chairmanships. He mentioned Chairmen Harry Flood Byrd (D Va.) of the Senate Finance Committee and James O. Eastland (D Miss.) of the Senate Judiciary Committee as examples.

ESTIMATED VOTE

The Associated Press Oct. 22 said an estimated 76,565,504 people were eligible to vote in the Nov. 4 election. The figure was about 1,686,358 over the number of qualified voters in the last mid-term election in 1954, but about four million below the 1956 total.

The AP estimated the probable total vote at 48,131,226, including those who voted in Maine's September election. That would be 5,548,299 higher than the record 1954 House off-year vote of 42,582,927.

Figures on the estimated eligible and probable vote in each state are given in the adjoining table.

Registration, Vote Estimates

The following chart shows the estimated number of registered voters eligible for the Nov. 4 Congressional and state elections, the estimated number of persons who will actually vote, and the official figures on the number of persons who voted in the House off-year election in 1954. (For number of persons of voting age, see Weekly Report p. 1342)

State	Registered 1958	Estimated Actual Vote, 1958	Actual House Vote, 1954
Ala.	850,000	350,000	279,789
Ariz.	391,000	315,000	223,402
Ark.	590,000	365,000	280,264
Calif.	6,752,421	5,050,000	3,873,326
Colo.	795,000	500,000	480,084
Conn.	1,240,000	1,000,000	935,744
Del.	190,000	120,000	144,236
Fla.	1,607,214	600,000	326,287
Ga.	1,270,000	350,000	350,171
Idaho	305,000	210,000	226,012
Ill.	5,060,686	3,450,000	3,257,721
Ind.	2,400,000	1,750,000	1,586,631
Iowa	1,700,000	875,000	817,253
Kan.	1,300,000	740,000	614,989
Ky.	1,500,000	550,000	668,488
La.	950,000	220,000	216,323
Maine	500,000	284,226*	241,443
Md.	1,227,473	750,000	638,875
Mass.	2,600,000	2,000,000	1,782,722
Mich.	3,600,000	2,150,000	2,133,390
Minn.	1,700,000	1,300,000	1,131,492
Miss.	460,000	100,000	99,342
Mo.	2,000,000	1,250,000	1,184,813
Mont.	305,614	235,000	224,587
Neb.	860,000	500,000	406,692
Nev.	120,000	84,000	77,639
N.H.	340,000	205,000	191,818
N.J.	2,700,000	1,700,000	1,786,853
N.M.	341,760	215,000	188,862
N.Y.	6,769,904	5,350,000	4,999,878
N.C.	2,000,000	800,000	604,179
N.D.	340,000	205,000	188,934
Ohio	5,200,000	3,450,000	2,498,837
Okla.	1,250,000	650,000	545,789
Ore.	850,000	650,000	564,494
Pa.	5,396,481	4,000,000	3,695,910
R.I.	440,000	330,000	326,059
S.C.	537,000	100,000	213,335
S.D.	380,000	250,000	232,167
Tenn.	1,250,000	425,000	344,797
Texas	2,055,000	900,000	622,763
Utah	390,000	285,000	263,031
Vt.	200,822	110,000	114,289
Va.	937,129	400,000	342,344
Wash.	1,370,000	900,000	815,822
W.Va.	1,078,000	593,000	591,492
Wis.	2,300,000	1,400,000	1,140,788
Wyo.	165,000	115,000	108,771
TOTAL	76,565,504	48,131,226	42,582,927

*Actual vote in Sept. 8 Maine Senate election.

SOURCE: ASSOCIATED PRESS



Around The Capitol

INTEGRATION

Educators and parents showed increasing anxiety over school shutdowns as Arkansas Gov. Orval E. Faubus (D) and Virginia Gov. J. Lindsay Almond Jr. (D) continued to refuse to permit court-ordered school integration. In Washington, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming told an Oct. 20 news conference "there is no doubt in my mind" that students forced to attend newly-organized private schools would "be up against some serious problems" when they sought college entrance. Flemming said many of the new schools would find it difficult to get accredited, since normally a school must operate at least one year before accreditation. (Weekly Report p. 1338)

These were the major integration developments:

Little Rock, Ark. -- Faubus Oct. 21 said he did not think the Little Rock Private School Corp. could exist indefinitely on private funds, but that the next session of the state legislature in January "would come up with something." Some 230 white senior high students Oct. 22 began private, segregated classes set up by the corporation in a former orphanage building, and a second private school, formed by Baptist groups, planned to open private, segregated classes Oct. 27.

Virginia -- The Norfolk Education Assn., composed of white teachers, Oct. 20 voted to discontinue tutoring programs for almost 4,000 children at the end of the present semester because their "indefinite continuation will retard the opening of our schools." The Norfolk City Council Oct. 21 scheduled a Nov. 18 referendum to determine whether it should petition Almond for return of the schools to local control. Almond Oct. 20 told the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers "I will not permit white and colored children to be taught together in the public schools." The Congress Oct. 22 voted 515-513 for a resolution urging all Parent-Teacher Assn. members in the state to support a local option plan on school desegregation, and defeated, on a 557-557 tie vote, a resolution supporting state "massive resistance" laws.

Other integration developments:

The Supreme Court Oct. 20 affirmed a lower court order that Negroes have a right to use park facilities managed by the New Orleans, La., City Park Improvement Assn., a municipal corporation.

In Birmingham, Ala., the Rev. F.L. Shuttlesworth, a Negro integration leader, Oct. 21 was ordered arrested on charges he incited an Oct. 20 Negro demonstration to test a new ordinance giving bus drivers the authority to assign passengers' seats.

A continuing rash of race-hatred bomb threats against Jewish groups brought proposals for legislation to make such bombings a Federal offense from Sen. J. Glenn Beall (R Md.), and Reps. Robert W. Kean (R N.J.) and Victor L. Anfuso (D N.Y.). Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R N.Y.) proposed a Federal-State conference on the matter. President Eisenhower in a letter to the American Jewish Congress released Oct. 21 said he would consider the group's proposal that he call a White House Conference to rally the Nation against bigotry.

FORMOSA CRISIS, DEBATE

Efforts to resolve the Formosa Strait crisis received a set-back when Communist China Oct. 20 abruptly ended its cease-fire and resumed bombardment of the offshore islands the day before Secretary of State John Foster Dulles arrived for talks with Nationalist China's President Chiang Kai-shek. The Communists said the United States had broken the truce by escorting Nationalist supplies to Quemoy the previous day, but the charge immediately was termed "false" by a Navy spokesman. In the U.S., the political barrage directed at the Administration's foreign policy continued, and pre-election speeches by President Eisenhower and Vice President Richard M. Nixon emphasized the important role foreign policy was playing in the campaign. (Weekly Report p. 1338; for text of President's Oct. 20 address see p. 1359)

Dulles and Chiang Oct. 23 ended their talks with a joint communique which said although a return to the mainland still was Chiang's sacred mission, the principal means of accomplishing it was through nationalism, democracy and social well-being, "and not the use of force." The statement said both the U.S. and the Nationalists "recognized that under present conditions the defense of the Quemoy islands together with the Matsus is closely related to the defense of Taiwan (Formosa) and Penghu (the Pescadores) islands...."

Elaborating on the talks at an Oct. 23 news conference, Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson said the Nationalists had asked for a convoy pledge and "we have reassured them" that "when it is considered by military authorities to be necessary, they will be resumed."

Dulles, in an Oct. 17 filmed interview released by the State Department Oct. 23, said the U.S. was "not going to attack or tolerate attacks against the Chinese Communists," but that the Government would "stand firm" to resist any Chinese Communist attacks.

On the political front, President Eisenhower Oct. 20 told a California GOP meeting that "during six years of serious international stress, America has remained at peace, and God willing, we are going to stay at peace." He told an Oct. 22 Chicago rally that "would-be aggressors are on notice that we are always ready to negotiate, never to appease." Nixon Oct. 21 told a Wilmington, Del., audience he believed foreign policy was the major issue in the off-year election and that "the American people like the President's leadership...." He told an Oct. 22 Providence, R.I., news conference the U.S. aim in the Far East crisis was to make Formosa "an island of freedom" rather than to tie American policy to Chiang Kai-shek. (See p. 1363)

Former President Harry S. Truman Oct. 22 told newsmen U.S. "bi-partisan foreign policy" was "upset in 1952 by President Eisenhower himself when he said he would go to Korea and settle the war there." Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (Texas) Oct. 21 told a Nashville, Tenn. group, "Bipartisanship should be a two-way street, and it should not run one way during a national crisis and another way during a political crisis."

WORLD SPACE AGENCY

COMMITTEE -- House Select Astronautics and Space Exploration.

ACTION -- Chairman John W. McCormack (D Mass.) Oct. 20 released a report by the Committee's staff recommending the creation of a new international organization on space development. The report urged that the United States, through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, take the lead in the creation of the proposed organization, to be composed of governments and scientific organizations. The proposed agency would coordinate international space research.

The need for such an organization, the report said, existed because "rival space efforts, besides being prohibitive economically, could in the end result in projecting current military rivalries to the limitless dimension of outer space." Agreement in the narrow area of research coordination could eventually lead to international agreement on economic, political and legal problems of the use of outer space, the report said.

The United States should act with "speed and decision" in forming the proposed organization, the report said, because "the inability to depend on Soviet cooperation and the lack of governmental space effort in most other countries offers a peculiarly good chance for the United States to mobilize the researches of most of the world's scientists in this field."

The report said the Soviet Union should be invited to become a "full-fledged partner" and open to world scientists its research centers. The report recommended that if the Soviet Union failed to become a member, the new organization be formed without Soviet participation.

The report stated that in countries other than the U.S. there were "some of the most respected and competent scientists...who are hampered in their work, not only by lack of money and facilities, but also by lack of government encouragement." These "non-Communist scientists, engineers, and technicians," the report said, "are turning to the United States as the best outlet for their creative abilities."

The report recommended that the United States not only finance the research of individual scientists and scientific organizations abroad, but also initiate international space programs in which the cost, research, and benefits were shared by all participating nations.

The report cited examples of research carried on in other nations which would benefit U.S. space programs.

The report advised the United States not to apply an "over-strict interpretation of security standards" to space research. U.S. security restrictions in scientific matters, according to the report, have "become an object of wide criticism...nowhere stronger than among our allies." To withhold non-military scientific information in space research, the report said, posed the risk of the "projection of military rivalry into space."

The report also recommended that formal and informal conferences be held between nations and legal experts to discuss the legal problems that evolved as the space age advanced.

ECONOMIC SITUATION

In a special study prepared for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Dr. Asher Achinstein of the Legislative Reference Service Oct. 16 criticized the Federal Reserve Board for its handling of the 1955 economic boom and the 1957-58 recession. Chairman J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.) said the Committee had taken no position on the report's findings, but recommended that Congress and "all who are concerned with the vital issues of monetary policy" pay "careful attention" to the study.

Achinstein said the Federal Reserve Board in 1955 had failed to act to dampen down the boom that started an upward trend in living costs after several years of steady prices. He criticized the board for raising bank loan interest rates in August 1957 when the recession started.

In a reply attached to Achinstein's study, the Federal Reserve Board said the criticism had been written before the recovery that began in mid-1958 and that Achinstein had based his conclusions on an expectation that the 1957-58 recession would be a severe one, while it had in actuality been one of the shortest on record.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 23 -- The Federal Reserve Board authorized the Philadelphia, Richmond, St. Louis, Minneapolis and Dallas Federal Reserve Banks to raise their discount rates from 2 percent to 2½ percent as of Oct. 24. (Weekly Report p. 1103)

HOUSING SITUATION

Rep. Albert Rains (D Ala.), chairman of the House Banking and Currency Housing Subcommittee, Oct. 12 urged the Administration to release immediately \$400 million in mortgage support funds. The money was made available by the emergency housing bill (S 3148 -- PL 364) passed by Congress last March. (Weekly Report p. 368) The bill provided a \$1 billion revolving special assistance fund for the Federal National Mortgage Assn. and increased the President's fund for allocation to FNMA from \$450 million to \$950 million. Rains charged the Administration with holding back expenditure of the \$950 million fund designed to support low-cost housing financed under the GI- and FHA-insured loan programs. The FNMA special assistance fund had been already entirely committed. (Weekly Report p. 1231)

Rains said the "pick-up in housing construction has been one of the encouraging factors" in raising hopes that the economy could shake off the recession but warned that the recent increase in housing construction would be short-lived, unless additional financial assistance were given to the industry.

Chairman John J. Sparkman (D Ala.) of the Senate Banking and Currency's Housing Subcommittee Oct. 21 announced his Subcommittee had launched a study to examine the adequacy of existing Federal programs for mortgage credit. He said the Subcommittee had invited more than 30 housing experts to contribute papers on questions relating to mortgage credit problems. He said the study would be made "concurrently with action on a 1959 housing bill" that he would introduce in January. (Weekly Report p. 1302)

Dates are listed as released by sources and are sometimes subject to change.

Committee Hearings

- Nov. 7, 10, 12, 14 -- NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM (S 4028), Senate Interior and Insular Affairs, Bend, Ore., San Francisco, Calif., Salt Lake City, Utah, and Albuquerque, N.M.
- Nov. 12 -- FEDERAL REGULATORY AGENCIES (CAB, FTC, ICC and tentatively, FCC), House Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Legislative Oversight Subc. (resume hearings).
- Nov. 12-13 -- BALLISTIC MISSILE INFORMATION, relations between Air Force and General Accounting Office, House Government Operations, Government Information Subc.
- Nov. 13 -- LOGGING AND SAWMILL INDUSTRY PROBLEMS, Senate Small Business, Superior, Wis.
- Nov. 17, 18 -- UTILIZATION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED FACILITIES, House Armed Services, Special Investigations Subc.
- Nov. 17-21 -- TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES, House Ways and Means, Internal Revenue Taxation Subc.
- Nov. 19 -- ARMED SERVICES BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS, House Armed Services, Special Investigations Subc.
- Dec. 1-7 -- AMERICAN INVESTMENTS ABROAD, House Ways and Means, Foreign Trade Policy Subc.
- Dec. 8-11 -- PUBLIC POWER FOR COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN STATES, Senate Public Works, Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors Subc., Portland, Ore., Seattle, Wash., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, and Kalispell, Mont.

Elections

- Nov. 4 -- State and national general elections.
- Nov. 25 -- Alaska general elections.

Other Events

- Oct. 24, 25 -- AMERICAN RAILWAY SUPERVISORS ASSN. (AFL-CIO), annual convention, Chicago, Ill.
- Oct. 27 -- PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, Republican campaign speech, Pittsburgh, Pa. (tentative).
- Oct. 28 -- PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, address to National Football Foundation at establishment of Football Hall of Fame, New York City.
- Oct. 31 -- U.S. armed forces scheduled to leave Lebanon.

- Nov. 4-7 -- WE, THE PEOPLE, annual convention, speech by Rep. Ralph W. Gwinn (R N.Y.), Chicago, Ill.
- Nov. 4-Dec. 5 -- UNESCO, 10th general conference of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.
- Nov. 6 -- AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Nov. 10 -- UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA (AFL-CIO), annual convention, St. Louis, Mo.
- Nov. 10-12 -- GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA INC., annual meeting, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N.Y.
- Nov. 12-16 -- NATO, 4th annual parliamentary conference, Paris.
- Nov. 17-18 -- AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN., 7th national agricultural credit conference, Sheraton Fontenelle Hotel, Omaha, Neb.
- Nov. 17-19 -- NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL, 45th national convention, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N.Y.
- Nov. 19-21 -- NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSN., 27th annual meeting, Rice Hotel, Houston, Texas.
- Nov. 22-25 -- AMERICAN ASSN. FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, first biennial convention, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.
- Nov. 24, 25 -- NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON METROPOLITAN GROWTH, sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.
- Nov. 25 -- National corn price support referendum.
- Dec. 8-11 -- AMERICAN FARM BUREAU, annual convention, Statler Hotel, Boston, Mass.
- Dec. 8-11 -- VEGETABLE GROWERS ASSN. OF AMERICA, annual convention, Hotel Cleveland and Public Auditorium, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Dec. 13 -- NATIONAL FOOD BROKERS ASSN., national food sales conference, Chicago, Ill.
- Jan. 14-17 -- AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSN., national convention, Omaha, Neb.

Correction

In the last paragraph of the story, "Integration," Weekly Report p. 1307, LeRoy Collins is identified incorrectly as Governor of Georgia. Collins is actually the Governor of Florida.



Party Unity Congressional Quarterly's annual study of party unity voting in the Senate and the House indicates voting splits in both parties, with the Democrats dominated by their liberal wing and the Republicans by their conservative wing. In 1958 there were 124 roll calls on which the majority of Republicans voted one way and the majority of Democrats the other. Among the Democrats, so-called liberals voted most often with the majority of their party, so-called conservatives most often against the majority of their party. Among the Republicans, it was the other way around. (Page 1343)

Wild West

From the Rockies to the Pacific, the outlook is for Democratic gains in the November election, according to CQ's district-by-district survey of election prospects in the West. California, Washington and Alaska, which votes Nov. 25, are expected to make the biggest contributions to the anticipated Democratic pickup of at least one Senate and four House seats, the survey showed. In most states, Democratic organizational strength is at its peak, and labor union drives to beat right-to-work propositions are expected to give Democratic candidates an added push. (Page 1350)

Cash for Congressmen

Latest official figures on campaign spending make it appear candidates for the House and Senate will be lucky to get enough money this year to buy soapboxes, far less television time. Official reports on campaign spending show political contributions of \$3.7 million and expenditures of \$3.5 million -- about \$5,000 for each Senate and House candidate. The figures show Republicans spent nearly half the total, Democrats and labor groups about a fifth each and miscellaneous organizations approximately 10 percent. (Page 1348)

NAACP Rates Congress

The National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People is sending its 300,000 members the voting records of Senators and Representatives seeking reelection in 1958. CQ lists the votes the NAACP considered important -- the majority of them on civil rights and minority group issues -- and indicates how the organization wanted Members of Congress to vote on each roll call. Page references to the CQ vote charts that show how each Congressman voted on the NAACP issues are provided so you can rate your own state delegation against the NAACP's position. (Page 1362)

How Many Will Vote?

Over 76 million citizens -- a record for an off-year election -- are eligible to vote in November: they've fulfilled the residence and age requirements, registered and, where necessary, paid their poll taxes. It's estimated that 48 million of those eligible actually will go to the polls in November. If so, U.S. citizens will cast their largest vote in history in a non-Presidential year. In 1954, the last off-year, 42.5 million persons voted in the House election. (Page 1364)

Politicking President

President Eisenhower last week took to the stump in a series of major campaign speeches in California and Illinois. The President called the Democrats a party with a split personality, half radical and half conservative, blamed them for Congress' failure to enact a labor anti-corruption bill in 1958, said a Republican Congress was needed to prevent overexpansion of the Federal Government. Mr. Eisenhower also defended his farm and foreign policies, said the U.S. was entering a period of prosperity without inflation. (Page 1359, 1363)

Here and There

While integration struggles continued in Arkansas and Virginia, Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler said the South had better be ready to accept a strong party platform on civil rights in 1960 or get out of the party.... Secretary of State Dulles went to Formosa to confer with Chiang Kai-shek.... Vice President Nixon continued to be the workhorse of the Republican Congressional campaign.... The United Mine Workers, one of the country's most powerful unions, issued a list of candidates it favors for election in mining states. (Page 1362, 1364, 1365)